CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the Pacific
LIBRARY

THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 3. JUNE, 1932. Vol. XXII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Layman's Point of View.

The Bishop of Lincoln contributes a preface to a layman's view of the existing religious situation in this country.* Dr. Swayne's preface concludes thus:

> 'Altogether a wholesome and kindly book. The two chapters on religion . . . should be very carefully considered by those of us who have the high and indeed dreadful responsibility of being commissioned teachers of the Christian religion. There may be, and indeed I think there is, more to be said from the standpoint of Christian faith than the writer allows himself to say, or finds himself able to say. He has been simply honest, and has allowed himself to go no further than his conviction carries him. That one who is so certainly honest, who is so entirely Christian in temper and outlook, should find himself thus restrained, should cause every Christian teacher some heart-searching and perhaps a measure of shame, or better still of penitence. I can only say that I am grateful for the book. It has helped me and I hope it will help others who may read it.'

The layman served on the Western front and can write with sanity of the horrors of those times. He expresses a very high regard for the devotion, heroism and humanity of the British chaplains: 'If ever a body of men deservedly earned the eternal respect, admiration and affection of their fellows, it was the padres.' He believes, however, that the Church had a wonderful opportunity at the conclusion of the War, but that it has failed to use it. He writes:

* *Behind a Mask.* By Henry N. Newsum, M.C. Published by J. W. Ruddock & Sons, Lincoln. Simpkin, Marshall & Co., Ltd. 3/6. (1932).

'It will be generally conceded, I think, that during the War the cause of religion received great impetus. On every hand, perhaps because of the prevalence of great sorrow, strain and heartbreaking anxiety, men and women were brought to feel the need of strength and courage greater than their own and comfort greater than human comfort. In their need they turned to religion, and in it, many I know, found what they were seeking.

One would have imagined, therefore, that confronted with so vast a field and a need so imperative, the Church after the War would have gone from strength to strength and that its influence would have become greater than ever before.

And yet I do not think that this is so. Somehow or other, the Church has allowed her opportunities to slip by. No one trying to view the position coldly and dispassionately can pretend that her influence is increasing. Rather, I think, it is growing less.'

Yet although organized and institutional Christianity in this country is weaker, our layman believes that diffused Christianity is stronger. He is of the opinion that 'there was never so much religion practised as there is to-day,' but he adds, 'All that I do say is that the influence of the Church as a Church is diminishing.' He does not turn to statistics for Church finance, baptisms, confirmations, communions and ordinations as supporting his statement. His proof is of a simpler and more reliable kind:

'Consider just a few things. Let any reader go over the names of those he is proud to call his friends, and let him think of all those people he meets in his everyday life and whom he likes and respects, and let him count up how many of them go to church regularly. I think the result will be a little staggering.'

'What can be the reason of so much apathy and half-heartedness? I believe there are a variety of reasons, but before I try to give them, for what they are worth, may I say just two things? The first, that I am painfully conscious that a theologian could pull to bits at once much of what I write; but I take some comfort from the fact that the average layman is not and never will be a theologian, and after all, it is a layman's standpoint that I am trying to put. Then again, I am afraid that what I have to say will sound like one continual prejudiced fault-finding; but here I can only plead that nothing I say is said in any mischievous, destructive spirit, but simply in the belief that if you are looking for weaknesses, it is no good wasting time gazing fondly at points of strength.'

His main reasons for his conclusions are three:

(1) 'Since the War I think that the Church has become so engrossed in the fascinating occupation of organizing and governing herself that she has been unable to devote sufficient time, energy and enthusiasm to her real mission, that of making religion a living thing in the lives of men and women.

She has been so obsessed with trying to turn religion into a well-organized business concern that she has lost sight of the fact that in so doing there is a danger of all the human spark being knocked out

of it. I know that organization is necessary, but I think the Church is making a fetish of it; the things that seem to matter are Electoral Rolls, Parochial Church Councils, Ruridecanal Conferences and so on; in short, organization from top to bottom.'

This will strike Canon Partridge and all our ecclesiastical bureaucrats and Church Assembly members as unjust and ungracious. There was need for financial and administrative reforms and the Assembly has sought to carry them out. It has done some good work in this respect, but it does not seem to realize that it has done enough for some years to come. Many Church people are heartily tired of these activities which seem to take up so much of the time and energy of their bishops and superior clergy to the neglect of their dioceses.

The older English clergy were so nobly indifferent to finance. They never talked about the Church's financial needs any more than they talked of their own. To-day, in this age of idealisms, there is ten times as much talk about their own material needs and material ills by our idealists as there was by the Victorians, whom it is popular to regard as materialists. Our idealism to-day is largely verbal, and if practised at all is practised at the expense of others. We seldom hear an idealist advocate a reform for which he is to pay himself. Our layman does not complain of the Church being unbusiness-like so much as being business-like in the wrong way. He writes:

'If the Church is going to be business-like, why not be truly business-like and face the fact that what she offers, in the form in which it is offered, only makes a limited appeal, and having faced this fact, set to work with all her energy to present her religion in a way which men and women really understand and therefore truly value. Then, I think, her financial problem will be a problem no longer. Not only will those who already give, give more freely, but what is far more important, fresh working capital will be attracted from huge sources at present untapped, and I include in the untapped sources not only that great body of people outside the Church, but many who are nominally within it, for an Electoral Roll is very like the list of a firm's customers in that it contains a terrible lot of dead accounts.'

(2) Layman's second reason is more familiar. He gives it as follows:

'The second reason why the Church's influence is less than it might be is to be found, I think, in the relationship which exists between clergy and laity. Many of the clergy labour under the acute disadvantage of having no deep first-hand knowledge of the mode of life, character and outlook of the people to whom they minister, and, equally, the laity cannot see the man for the parson.'

Layman thinks they should be men first and padres second:

> 'Knowledge of the Bible, however profound, will never make a man an efficient clergyman unless there is combined with it a very considerable knowledge of humanity.'

He thinks that if an ordinand would earn his living for a year, as a working man, before ordination, it would help greatly, especially if he lodged with a workman in his cottage. It seems to us, however, that this desirable human sympathy will hardly be acquired in this way. It is a gift of nature and of grace, far more than of experience. Masters who have been servants are often much harder and less humane than masters who have not been servants. Certainly greater stress should be laid on the possession of social gifts and pleasant manners in ordinands than is perhaps done at present. There are young men possessed of golden gifts who are shy and diffident, but we hardly think that living as a workman for a year would endow them with clubbability. *Poeta nascitur non fit*, and it is equally true of the pastor of souls. We certainly favour the ordination of older men who have had, before ordination, some experience of the world.

(3) Layman's third reason, and it is much more profound, is 'the form in which the Church presents her message.' This message the Church mainly presents in her worship and pulpit teaching. Each of these methods, he declares, 'is increasingly failing to make its appeal':

> 'A growing number of thoughtful people . . . find that the services which they attend do not mean to them what they feel they should mean, do not help them as they want to be helped. . . . To-day people are no longer content to believe what they are told they should believe, no longer prepared to go and repeat with their lips a whole lot of things they do not believe in their hearts.'

The Prayer Book, he declares, contains much that sounds utterly foreign to our best instincts. Layman revolts against the *Quicunque Vult's* presentation of the Christian faith. He revolts against 'the self-centredness' of some of the Prayer Book teaching. The motive of living so as 'to create happiness for others is in comparison hardly emphasized at all' in it. 'Bound up with this selfishness of outlook is the pervading attitude of perpetual and rather cringing confession of our unworthiness and constant supplication for pardon. Dislike of such an attitude is

perfectly consistent with an acute sense of one's own shortcomings.' Then he adds:

> 'Quite apart, however, from falling short in some respects of our earthly standards of tolerance, manliness and unselfishness, the Prayer Book by its lack of reality both fails to hold our attention and also sometimes strains our credulity. . . . The Prayer Book seems to be such an amazing mixture of reality and unreality of thought. . . . In its unreality of outlook it has fallen centuries behind the times.'

Layman feels this last sentence will rouse orthodox churchpeople to say 'the religion of Christianity is unchanged because it is unchangeable.' He replies:

> 'There is only one part of religion which is unchangeable, and that is the infinite wisdom of the teaching of Christ; and even here, I believe, if He came again to visit the earth to-day, even His teaching could not be couched in the same words.'

The clergy, layman feels, 'do not concentrate sufficiently on the teaching of Christ or model themselves on His methods.' This he expands as follows:

> 'I think it was its utter humanity. Christ did not insist on a rigid adherence to one Creed, Christ did not devote His energies to building up a perfect system of organization among His followers. Instead, He concentrated first of all on preaching the universal Fatherhood of God, and secondly on giving people a simple, practical every-day-of-the-week religion, a religion which they could understand because He explained it by means of homely illustrations taken from the everyday life of those He taught, a life which He Himself knew so well.'

Layman sees an unorthodox type of religion springing up on all sides. He thus describes it:

> 'A sort of personal religion of their own creation. Utterly unorthodox, not resting on authority or tradition, the outcome partly of their instincts and partly of their powers of reasoning, this religion is nevertheless a very real thing to them and forms, at any rate, some sort of solid basis on which to build their lives.'

Layman's ideal of the religion that we need to-day, and which the Church ought to present, seems to us to go to the very heart of the Gospel of Jesus:

> 'A religion child-like in the utter simplicity of its beliefs, child-like in that it is content to leave in God's hands so much that it cannot understand; but I think that it is a man's religion too, for it puts practice far above precept and it sets far more store on what people are than on what they profess to believe.'

We observe, and it is not unimportant in the chapter 'What can a man believe?' that although layman's declaration of faith holds on to the essentials of the religion of Jesus Himself, it

omits nearly all dogmas of Anglican orthodoxy. Still it is the religion of the Lord's Prayer, the Two Great Commandments, the Beatitudes, and the parable of the Prodigal Son. Did not the Church act unwisely when it passed beyond this? It is possible that it had to do so. Nevertheless might it not be well for the Church to shed the accumulations of the ages and to return to the primitive Christian faith by insisting on no more than the fundamentals contained in the religion of Jesus Himself? We believe that the needs of Christian propaganda, Christian reunion, and Christian truth and freedom, at home and abroad, demand such a simplification of our doctrinal standards.

The layman concludes his book with these words:

> 'All my religious beliefs and hopes are centred round a God who is the Creator of life and who reveals and expresses Himself through an infinite variety of beautiful and lovable things which His creation contains. A God who is above all the Perfect Father of struggling humanity, infinitely wise and just, yet infinitely understanding; to whom we can pray in complete confidence that He will answer each and every prayer in the best possible way, even though we may not ourselves perceive the answer; a God who watches what we try to achieve rather than what we profess to believe. Last of all, a belief that we shall all meet again in another life where this world's injustices and inequalities will all be smoothed away, and where our own eternal peace and happiness will depend on the extent to which each one of us has tried to create happiness in our life on earth.
>
> A creed like this I could at least say with a sincerity which came from the bottom of my heart.'

What a tragedy that one whose Christian faith is of this quality should be alienated from his Church, and that not because he is sub-Christian, but because she is.

Darwinism and the Christian Church.

In the *Contemporary Review* for May, Dr. F. A. M. Spencer uses the jubilee of Darwin's funeral in the Abbey to treat the relations of Darwinism and Christianity. Darwin, he points out, was in his later years an agnostic, but never an atheist. Liddon, the week after Darwin's death, 'avowed his belief in the permissibility to a Christian of the theory of evolution.' Yet he combined with this concession a declaration of his belief in man's original righteousness and original sin. 'These truths,' he said, 'are of the essence of Christian belief.' This was nearly a quarter of a century after Darwin and Wallace had put forward their theory (1858).

Although many Broad Churchmen, like Charles Kingsley, accepted Darwinism, the High Churchmen did not do so until the years immediately before the publication of *Lux Mundi* in 1889, under the leadership of Charles Gore and that extraordinarily attractive and influential personality, Aubrey Moore. Dr. Spencer notes that Aubrey Moore in three anonymous articles in the *Guardian*, reviewing *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, gave an enthusiastic welcome to the doctrine of evolution as a support to Christian theology:

> 'As a theory it is infinitely more Christian than the theory of "special creations," for it implies the immanence of God in Nature and the omnipresence of His creative power.'

If John Keble was the poet of the early Tractarians, William Wordsworth was the poet of their no less distinguished successors of the *Lux Mundi* school. Writing as a philosophical theologian, Aubrey Moore pointed out that the doctrine of 'occasional intervention implies ordinary absence and agrees rather with the old-fashioned deism than with Christian theism.'

It is of interest to note that it was only the preliminary acceptance of the results of the higher criticism of the Scriptures which rendered it possible for Anglo-Catholicism to accept Darwinism. It is chiefly its opposition to modern Biblical criticism which has checked the acceptance of Darwinism by the Roman Church. In 1893 the famous encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* declared of the Bible:

> 'All those books, and those books in their entirety, which the Church regards as sacred and canonical were written with all their parts under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Now, far from admitting the co-existence of error, Divine inspiration by itself excludes all error, and that also of necessity, since God, the Supreme Truth, must be incapable of teaching error.'

Notwithstanding the immense difficulties which this declaration presents to the acceptance of Darwinism by Romanists, the Rectoral Council of the Catholic University of Louvain unanimously accepted in 1909 the invitation of the University of Cambridge to take part in the centenary of Darwin's birth and the fiftieth anniversary of the publication of *The Origin of Species*, and in 1921 Canon Dorlodot, who had represented the University of Louvain on that occasion, brought out a little book, which was presently translated into English under the title

Darwinism and Catholic Thought. In this he maintained that the theory of natural evolution was agreeable to Catholic doctrine. From this volume Dr. Spencer gives the following citation :

> 'The more science progresses, the more resounding becomes the voice of Nature proclaiming the glory of its Creator. And among the heralds employed by Nature in order to spread its voice right to the extremities of the globe, I think that it is only right to put Charles Darwin in the first rank, side by side with that other glory of Cambridge, Isaac Newton.'

This book received the *Nihil obstat* and the *Imprimatur*. Truly its author was more fortunate than the distinguished Roman Catholic scientist, Professor St. George Mivart, who in 1900 was excommunicated for his liberalism by Cardinal Vaughan. We observe that the French Roman Catholic *savant*, M. Edouard Le Roy, has recently had his works condemned by the Supreme Council of the Holy Office, including his volume entitled *Les Origines humaines et l'Evolution de l'Intelligence*, published in 1930. Although Roman Catholicism is not in the vanguard in the open-minded and fearless acceptance of scientific truth, at least it has sufficient sense to follow in the rear. Nevertheless, Roman Catholic scientists, unless like the great Pasteur they keep their science in one compartment and their theology in another, have to walk very warily.

The Church of England may be said to have accepted Evolution officially when Frederick Temple, Bishop of Exeter, delivered the Bampton Lectures in 1884. Lecture VI is entitled 'Apparent Collision between Religion and the Doctrine of Evolution,' the last section of which dealt with the evolution of man as not inconsistent with the dignity of humanity.

But although the conflict over evolution is past, two most important applications of it, as Dr. Spencer points out, have to be grappled with by the Church and nation :

> 'We are faced with the prospect of rapid racial degeneration, owing to the reversal of natural selection, partly by our humane care of the sickly and sub-normal, and partly by the more or less voluntary limitation of births among the more intelligent. To counter this . . . the sterilization of the feeble-minded, who at present form a considerable proportion of the population and are breeding at an alarming rate, is required. Secondly, . . . the reversal of the differential birth-rate by the encouragement of the more capable and intelligent to have more children. . . . Here we see an urgent problem in social ethics, which it would be lamentable folly for the leaders of Christianity to ignore.'

Dr. Henson and Evangelical Patronage Trusts.

Dr. Henson in *Sibbes and Simeon** has fiercely attacked the Evangelical Patronage Trusts. Whether these Patronage Trusts are more offensive to him because they constitute the fortresses of an unprogressive and insular Protestantism, or because they curb episcopal absolutism, is not clear, nor does it matter greatly. The system of patronage trusts is of course theoretically indefensible, as indefensible as episcopal palaces and episcopal incomes. All may be condemned as due to the invasion of the Church by materialism and mammonism. The historian, however, views these things in a more humane way than does the ecclesiastical controversialist or the puritan preacher. He sees them come into existence to meet ecclesiastical needs and as the embodiment of ecclesiastical ideals, and although those needs and ideals may have altered with the passage of time, yet if the things in question continue to be put to a reasonably good use, the understanding historian regards them with tolerance, if not with favour, and does not demand their abolition.

The Evangelical Patronage Trusts came into existence as a means of assisting the Evangelical Movement to maintain itself influentially within the English Church. It was an endowment of Evangelicalism, and an endowment which entailed self-sacrificing effort by evangelical laymen and clergymen. By these patronage trusts, evangelical clergymen of piety and power were enabled to hold pastoral positions to which the Church authorities of that day would not have promoted them because they did not like the Evangelical movement. It is at least arguable that if the Evangelical Patronage Trusts had not been founded Evangelicalism, like Methodism, would have had to exist outside the Church of England, to that Church's great loss. It may also be claimed, as Bishop Knox has shewn, that the administration of these Evangelical Patronage Trusts has been of real service to the influence and extension of the Christian religion both at home and abroad. Good clergymen have been appointed by them and they have done good work, and in the vast majority of cases the clergymen appointed have been acceptable to the

* Published by Hodder & Stoughton, price 1/- (1932).

parishioners. It is quite possible that the Bishops, as Dr. Henson seems to suggest, would like to administer the patronage held by these trusts. We know enough of human nature to suppose that this is possible, but such covetous sentiments ought not to be encouraged. Had not the Evangelicals, by a certain financial astuteness and munificent expenditure, taken advantage of a situation, created by a muddled patronage measure in the Church of Assembly, to outstrip their Anglo-Catholic rivals in the race to secure advowsons, we should not have heard anything of the iniquity of patronage trusts. Had the Evangelicals handed over their new patronage to St. Peter's Hall, Oxford, they might have escaped all censure.

Patronage in the Church of England must be administered by someone, and our Church authorities are convinced that the parishioners ought not to administer it—although the parishioners had this right in the Primitive Church. Then we believe that experience justifies the inclusion, in our English Church system, of party patronage trusts, providing they be administered with real consideration for the wishes and welfare of the parishioners, as in the case of the Evangelical Trusts they very largely are, should be permitted to remain. We write this as Modernists who have no patronage trusts, and have as little hope from a dominant Evangelicalism as from a dominant Anglo-Catholicism. We see many signs, however, that a growing spirit of tolerance and comprehensiveness is slowly permeating both the Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic parties, and it is to the growth of that spirit, which seeks to use privilege and power for the general good, and not to drastic reforms, that we must look for the elimination of abuses.

The Modernist Manifesto on Eucharistic Hospitality.

The reports of the recent proceedings of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury provide depressing reading for those who desire more cordial relations with Free Churchmen. The very moderate proposals of the Bishops to extend 'hospitality' to Free Churchmen by permitting them to receive the Holy Communion in our churches, when unable to attend their own, was stiffly opposed. Finally, by a very narrow majority, the Lower House avoided a conflict with the Upper. Ever

since the reign of William III, when the Lower House defeated the Comprehension Scheme for the inclusion of Dissenters in the National Church, the Lower House of Convocation has been the stronghold of a rigid and uncompromising exclusiveness. This clerical conservatism does not make us despair of the Church of England, since the bishops and laity for the most part reflect a more charitable and reasonable spirit.

The Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union, we are glad to observe, took the opportunity to publish the following statement in the press:

> The Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union is convinced that the most practical way of putting an end to 'our unhappy divisions' in this country is the establishment of inter-communion between the Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Free Churches. This step in itself is most desirable, whether or not it should lead to some form of federation or reunion.
>
> (i) The Council affirms the principle of Christian hospitality that the Communion of the Church should be open to all Christians who desire to come.
>
> (ii) Inasmuch as (*a*) the Bishops in the Lambeth Appeal (1920) stated:—
>
> > We acknowledge all those who believe in Our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity as sharing with us membership in the Universal Church of Christ, which is His Body;
>
> and (*b*) a Committee consisting of the two Archbishops and twelve Bishops expressed the opinion (1922) that the Ministries of the Free Churches
>
> are real Ministries of Christ's Word and Sacrament in the Universal Church,
>
> the Council feels that members of the Church of England must regard members of such Free Churches as fellow Churchmen.
>
> (iii) The Council is therefore of the opinion that it should be competent for every minister of the Church of England to welcome members of other Christian denominations to partake of the Holy Communion if they desire to come.
>
> (iv) This would not conflict with the Confirmation Rubric, which is a domestic rule of the Church of England based upon the practice of the pre-Reformation Church, and refers to a period before the rise of Nonconformity. In the Council's view the rubric does not cover the case of the Free Churches at the present day.
>
> (v) The Council regards as untenable the assertion that persons cannot join together in the Holy Communion unless they hold the same views regarding the Sacrament. No requirement is laid down in any rubric as to the acceptance of any specific sacramental teaching as a condition of Communion.
>
> (vi) The Council considers that the recognition of such wider fellowship in the Sacrament should be reciprocal.

No Modernist undervalues, in our own Church life, Confirmation and the instruction for it as a needful preparation for the beneficial reception of the Holy Communion and as a needful preliminary for full-membership in our Church. In the case of communicant members of other Christian bodies, however, the matter is entirely different. Our Confirmation Service is intended for those who have been baptized in the English Church and with our Baptismal Service. Our Confirmation Service is quite unsuitable for the admission of communicants from other bodies to membership in the Church of England. We ought to have a special service authorized for that purpose in the case of those who desire permanent membership in the English Church. In the case of those who desire temporary hospitality, but not membership, a preliminary service of admission should not be insisted on before they come to our altars for Holy Communion. It should be clearly understood that any communicant of any Christian body is welcome on any occasion to share in the Holy Communion in the Church of England, and that because we regard the Holy Communion not as ours, but the Lord's, and His saying, 'him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out,' prevents our adopting an attitude of exclusion. As it is a mistake for the Church to be more dogmatic than our Lord, so also is it a mistake for it to be less comprehensive.

Sir Lewis Dibdin and the Church Situation.

Sober-minded Churchmen, in view of Lord Wolmer's campaign for securing a modification in the existing relations of Church and State in England, will be grateful to Sir Lewis Dibdin, Dean of the Arches, for his collection of essays, published under the title *Establishment in England*.*

Sir Lewis Dibdin, as the chief legal official of the Archbishop of Canterbury, is admirably judicial. He does not anticipate that the Archbishops' Commission to consider and advise on the relations of Church and State in England, appointed in 1928, will issue its report in the near future. Of it he writes :

> 'The public, so far as one can judge, have taken very little interest in the work of that Commission. They were greatly shocked at the spectacle of Bishops disregarding—it is hardly fair to call it flouting—

* Published by Macmillans, price 7/6 (1932).

the decision of the House of Commons. It was remembered that that decision was given in accordance with the Enabling Act and within ten years of the Act having been discussed in Parliament, and notwithstanding the sympathetic declaration of the Bishops at that time that the power of Parliament was intended to remain unaltered and absolute. But the Church counts for so much less than it did a generation ago, and things move so quickly that the action of the Bishops and the possible outcome of the Commission are neither much remembered nor greatly regarded' (p. 2*f.*).

The Dean of the Arches sees in the present period of our Church's history parallels to that which preceded the Tudor Reformation. He writes:

'Then, as now, the parochial clergy were largely ignored and the Bishops were suspected. There are of course very large exceptions now, as probably there were then. There are many incumbents, some Anglo-Catholics and some Evangelicals, and some neither, who are greatly and deservedly beloved . . . and are immensely influential, especially in poor and populous parishes. And there are Bishops of whom the same is true. Yet if the Church of England be looked at in bulk it must be admitted . . . that the churches are very thinly attended and the clergy, whether incumbents or bishops, do not count for much' (p. 3).

Sir Lewis Dibdin warns those who think that the conditions which were produced by the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church of Wales will be reproduced by the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church of England, that they are making a grave and dangerous mistake. He also thinks that the prospect of getting such terms from Parliament for the Church of England as the Church of Scotland secured in 1921 is highly improbable. He points out that

'The Church of Scotland Act, 1921, contains in an Appendix and enacts as lawful certain "Articles Declaratory to the Constitution of the Church of Scotland in Matters Spiritual." Those Articles are the basis of agreement in the Church of Scotland. The Act of 1921 was passed at about the same period as the Enabling Act, *i.e.* during the post-war time when Parliament was in a remarkable mood. But some such Articles would have to be the basis of any Act dealing with the Church of England while preserving establishment. It is unlikely that, without the practical agreement of Churchmen, the House of Commons would pass a Bill and would accept the scheme contained in it. It would seem therefore that the first duty of the Church Self-Government League is to publish the Declaratory Articles they propose and to seek the adhesion of all Churchmen to those Articles. How long would it take to procure general agreement to those Articles? It is possible that as the proposals of the Church Self-Government League seem to necessitate the repeal of most of the Reformation statutes, that alone, without going into deeper matters, may prevent any such general agreement as would seem to be necessary' (p. 13).

THE ENGLISH LAITY AND CHURCH REFORM.

The recent discussions in the Canterbury Lower Convocation must strengthen the view that it is hopeless to look to the clergy as a whole to lead in a campaign for Church reform. The Lower Convocation of Canterbury has a bad record and it is doing nothing to live it down. It seems to have stood for reaction and retrogression in every crisis. Had the Church of England been guided by it, we should still have been subject to Papal tyranny and be living as the adherents of Roman superstition. Sir Lewis Dibdin stresses this in his description of the action of the Lower Canterbury Convocation on the accession of Queen Elizabeth.

> 'The Canterbury Lower Convocation, truly representing the mind of the Clergy, passed resolutions in favour of the Mass and the Pope's jurisdiction, declaring that laymen could not properly meddle with questions of faith, sacraments or ecclesiastical discipline, which were for the Clergy. . . . Meanwhile, at the very same time, Parliament passed the two Acts, I Eliz. ch. 1 (Supremacy) and I Eliz. ch. 2 (Uniformity). Under the first, all foreign authority, spiritual and temporal, was abolished, and the matter was enforced by the injunctions issued under that Act. Under the second Act, the second Prayer Book of Edward was enacted, which not only abolished the Mass but was itself a lay pronouncement as to Faith and Sacraments. To quote Professor Gwatkin: "The Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity and the Injunctions form the transition from the old law to the new; and they were all the work of the laity: Convocation was not even coerced into formal acquiescence, as in Henry's time, but simply ignored."'

Sir Lewis Dibdin also makes it very clear that the laity, acting through Parliament, have had much more to do with the authorization of our public worship, since the Reformation, than have the clergy. He writes:

> 'We are faced, to start with, by the undoubted fact that our present Prayer Book has been legalized to a large extent by the action of Parliament and not by the action of the Church. The first Prayer Book of Edward VI was in 1549. It was certainly set up by the first Act of Uniformity. It may have had the consent of Convocation. It is very doubtful, and the trend of modern research is against the notion. The second Prayer Book of Edward VI had, so far as is known, Parliamentary sanction only. The Prayer Book of Elizabeth had Parliamentary sanction only. The Prayer Book of James I had neither Parliamentary nor synodical sanction, but was issued by the King. The Prayer Book of Charles II had the approval of Convocation; and the Commons, when the last Act of Uniformity was passed, resolved by a majority that, although they could consider the Prayer Book in detail, they would not do so. This is the short story of all the Prayer Books.

'What is the meaning of it? Plainly it does not mean that men in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were indifferent to the contents of their Prayer Books. Equally plainly it does not mean that then, any more than now, the whole House of Commons consisted of Church people. Take the 1662 House of Commons—for this purpose the most important. Without saying too much about the eager assertions of horrified people on the morrow of the Commons' rejection of the recent Prayer Book, it is fair to believe that there is no instructed person to-day who does not know that the House of Commons in 1662 contained many non-Churchmen; how many, whether twenty or fifty or sixty, it would be rash to speculate. The City of London was represented by two Dissenters. The House contained rather more than 500 members. Whatever may be the right of the individual members, and whatever precedents may teach, the question whether Christian Nonconformists ought now to meddle with the teaching of the Church of England is one of taste rather than of right' (p. 100).

We seem to be approaching a situation in which our Church policy will have to conform with the fundamental convictions of the Christian laity of this land, or we shall experience the national disasters of disestablishment, disendowment, disruption and dissolution of our venerable Church. The future is far from clear and no one can foresee what line the laity in Parliament may take, but we may be sure that it will differ widely from the line taken by the Lower Convocation of Canterbury. Sir Lewis Dibdin writes:

'No one knows to-day whether the nation, so far as it is Christian, desires to keep an established institution in its midst. If it does, I suppose the nation is entitled to use the existing cathedrals, churches, parsonages and endowments for the purposes of such an institution, just as the nation transferred these things from the old Roman Catholic users to the Church of England possessors of them in Elizabeth's time. It seems to be sometimes assumed that Churchmen are the only people to have a say in the matter. But surely it is not so. The nation has a right also. It may be that the English people are indifferent, so that the Church of England may go its own way, apart altogether from the State and with only such modified disendowment as modern opinion would approve. But on the other hand the State may say, as it said in 1559, we desire to possess an established form of Christian religion, and within very wide limits we desire to define that form. That kind of claim will seem very dreadful to those who look on the Church as a rather narrow Society, just as it seemed impossible to Roman Catholics in 1559. Nevertheless, to those who believe in a wide Christianity it will not seem impracticable.'

THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE OLD TESTAMENT*

By Maurice A. Canney, M.A., Professor of Semitic Languages and Literature in Manchester University.

IT is curious how great a prejudice seems to prevail in some quarters against anthropology. This prejudice is not confined to theologians. It is shared by classical scholars. Discussing this prejudice with a friend, himself an anthropologist, he suggested that possibly it is due to a misunderstanding of the meaning and scope of anthropology. Anthropology, he suggested, is disliked because it is supposed to be concerned almost entirely with 'savages.' This is possible, but there is a more likely explanation than this. It is that in a dim sort of way the meaning and scope of anthropology are understood only too well. Anthropology is the ruthless enemy of all superstitions and false pretensions, whether they be ancient, medieval, or modern. Theologians and classical scholars have this in common: they both possess treasures for which they claim a certain kind of uniqueness — a collection of writings and a body of teaching which for a long time were supposed to have no sort of parallel. This pretension has of course long since been disproved, but old beliefs die hard. A new claim or pretension has been substituted. It is to the effect that, compared with the collection of writings and body of teaching inherited by classical scholars and theologians, other writings and other teachings simply do not count.

Anthropology means, of course, much more than the study of so-called 'savages.' It is usually explained to mean 'teaching about man,' teaching about the human body and mind. But scientifically understood it embraces more than is conveyed by these words, for it means the study of mankind — its pedigree, its beliefs, its institutions—*without racial or religious prejudice*. It is in a wide sense what Professor Elliot Smith so aptly calls 'Human History.' It follows that at the outset anthropology

* Part of a paper with this title read at the XVIII^e^ Congrès International des Orientalistes, held at Leiden in September, 1931.

has no special interest in Egyptians, Arabs, Jews, Persians, Hindus, Greeks and Romans, or indeed in Muhammadanism, Judaism, Parsism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Hellenism, Romanism and Christianity. It has no *a priori* leaning towards or antipathy to any of these. It is interested equally and impartially in each and all of them as human types and activities capable of scientific study and analysis. Accordingly, the anthropologist declines to admit without full and adequate examination that any particular race has enjoyed an innate superiority over other races, or that any particular race has been endowed with a peculiar gift of inspiration. He insists upon judging and estimating peoples purely on their merits, and not on their pretensions. Pursuing the method of science, he cannot do otherwise than study the habits, customs, beliefs, ceremonies and institutions of peoples throughout the world, together with their writings, if they have any, in their geographical, social and literary environment as manifestations of ordinary mundane activities.

How then may the anthropologist be expected to approach what is commonly known as the Old Testament? It would take too long to refer to all his reactions. Suffice it to indicate a few of them. At the very first he will think that 'Old Testament' is a very unsatisfactory way of describing the classical literature of the Jews, whatever may be thought of 'New Testament' as a description of the classical literature of the Christians. It is not of course the Jewish name. The Jews divide their classical literature into four parts and speak of the Law, the Early Prophets, the Later Prophets, and the Writings. Old Testament and New Testament are theological terms. The sooner they are abolished the better. Hebrew Scriptures and Christian Scriptures are much more accurate descriptions. In a new approach to a subject one of the first essentials is to get rid of an obsolete terminology.

There is an even more serious objection to the names Old Testament and New Testament. This is the implication that the two collections of writings are inseparable, which is false. In the original texts the so-called Old Testament and New Testament are of course distinct and separate, forming two volumes in two different languages. Why then in the translations should they be combined and bound together in one volume to form the

Christian Bible? The practice of doing this has been a bad thing for science, and a worse thing for Christianity. As regards the latter, place the Bible in the hands of an uninitiated person, and the chances are that after reading certain parts of the Old Testament he will throw the whole book on one side in disgust. The two collections of writings should be kept distinct, bound separately, and studied more or less independently. There is of course a close relationship between the two, but it is mainly of historical and theological interest, like the relationship between Judaism, Christianity and Muhammadanism. No one thinks of binding in one volume the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the Kur'ân! It would be a great gain to science if the so-called Old Testament could be studied in and for itself without any anxious thought as to how the study of it may affect the New Testament. And it would be no loss to Christianity — indeed, it would be an immense gain — if the 'Old Testament' ceased to be regarded as a work of edification and an aid to devotion for Christians. Its value and importance for Jews is of course another matter. They have their own religious use for it, and their own methods of interpretation. It is the sacred book of Judaism, the very words of which, apart from their precise meaning, like the words of other sacred books, have power to give life and health. It is not the sacred book of Christianity, whose Founder was Himself the life-giver (*Mahyānā*, the Aramaic equivalent of the Greek *Sōter*, Saviour), and the author of a *new* teaching.[1]

The time has come for the 'Old Testament' to be studied by anthropologists, archaeologists, philologists and historians as a collection of human documents. Its interpretation should no longer be entrusted to persons whose ideas are so dominated by a special interest in the 'New Testament' that all the time they are reading the one collection of writings their eyes and thoughts are straying to the other. Such persons believe of course that their attitude is the right one. The Jews, they say, were the chosen people. The 'Old Testament' is the classical literature of the chosen people. Since it was also the literature in which

[1] According to Loisy the New Testament as a whole owes more to the mystery religions of the Near and Middle East than to the Old Testament. Nor must we forget its debt to Zoroastrianism.

was educated one who is said to have been specially chosen to be the Light of the World, in it must be reflected the light of the Light of the World. With this claim, that the Jews were and are a chosen people or a peculiar people in the sense of being unique, anthropology will join issue at once. The belief held by Jews, and encouraged by Christians, that they are the chosen people of God, like the belief in the uniqueness of the Hebrew religion, has in the light of modern knowledge no substantial foundation. A superiority-complex, it has as a matter of fact been nothing less than one of the calamities of history. The sufferings endured by the Jews throughout the ages have been largely the result of their racial pride.

Consider now the translations of the 'Old Testament'; in English, the versions known as Authorized and Revised. When he reads these, the anthropologist cannot help feeling that they have suffered through the special interests of the translators, and particularly through an all-absorbing interest in the 'New Testament.' Words like save, salvation, saviour, soul, spirit, heaven (instead of sky) are used with quite unnecessary frequency. Moreover, the close relationship of ideas in the 'Old Testament' to ideas found in the sacred and magical texts of peoples other than the Jews is frequently obscured or disguised. How many readers realize, for instance, that the cross as a sign is referred to in the 'Old Testament'?[2] Take another example. Among the Arabs the word *baraka* is used often to denote a magical, life-giving power or potency, and it is difficult to find as a translation a term having quite the same connotation. An anthropologist, like Westermarck, uses the same word in transliteration. A corresponding word, vocalized *berakah*, is found in Hebrew, and there can be do doubt that often where it is used in the 'Old Testament' it has exactly the same significance as the Arabic word; yet almost without exception it is translated by the vague term 'blessing.' Further, it should be noted that, although there are not many compound nouns in Hebrew, there are many compound expressions which correspond to compound expressions in other languages. These are broken up and translated in such a way as to miss the similarity or equivalence. Thus we read of the 'breath of life' instead of the 'life-breath';

[2] (*Ezek.* ix, 4, 6; *Job* xxxi, 35.)

the 'tree of life' instead of the 'life-tree'; the 'bundle of life' instead of the 'life-bundle'; the 'spring of life' instead of the 'life-spring.' It is true that there are now some modern translations of the Bible in which to some extent a change has been made, but these are still dominated by certain fixed theological ideas. One of the needs of the time is a new and different kind of translation of the 'Old Testament,' made by scholars who approach the matter from the anthropological rather than from the theological side.

The importance of the anthropological approach to the 'Old Testament' has as a matter of fact ceased to be a matter of theory. In varying ways and degrees it has been demonstrated by such scholars as Wensinck in Holland, Jirku in Germany, Lods in France, Mowinckel in Norway, Astley and Hooke in England. Mowinckel's studies, *Psalmenstudien*, in particular, are epoch-making. They are the more significant because in many respects they are in line with investigations made by a school of specialists in anthropology in England.

It will be obvious that the attitude of the anthropologist, like that of the archaeologist, towards the historical criticism of the 'Old Testament' will be non-committal. The historical criticism of the 'Old Testament,' in the form which it has taken, has been influenced largely by the evolutionist theory of the development of civilization which was supposed to follow upon the researches of Charles Darwin. Dr. Mowinckel, with his failure to distinguish between 'primitive' and 'savage,' and to take adequate account of degradation in culture, seems to be still much under the influence of this theory. If, as some of us maintain, it no longer holds good, it is not necessary to suppose that the Hebrews gradually emerged from a state of 'primitiveness' to a state of high civilization. Certainly, if the accounts are to be trusted, when they sought to settle themselves in Canaan among a people more civilized, as we now know, than were the Hebrews themselves, they behaved with the most revolting brutality. But brutality in organized warfare is not, as Perry and Elliot Smith have pointed out, characteristic of 'primitives.' There is really nothing to show that the Hebrews passed through a number of well-recognized and ever ascending stages of culture. The ideas

which are described as 'primitive' are the degraded and distorted copies of ideas borrowed from higher civilizations. Nor does it seem to be true that the Hebrews gradually developed a belief in monotheism. It was an old belief which they revived. If Dr. W. Schmidt of Vienna is right, a belief in monotheism is characteristic of what he calls 'primitive' peoples. All we can say is that under various influences and compulsions the Jews adopted the belief and at a comparatively late date gave it a stamp of their own. Another conception, that of a Messiah or an ideal king, was not peculiar to the Jews. It has been found, as we know now from the study of other ancient religions, among the Egyptians, Babylonians, Persians and Indians.

Anthropology, like archaeology, demands a re-examination of the so-called results of Old Testament Criticism. It is quite clear that a worker like Dr. Mowinckel, who may be said to approach the problems of the 'Old Testament' from the anthropological side; a worker like Dr. Garstang, who approaches them from the archaeological side; and a worker like Dr. Lods, who approaches them from both sides, are all equally embarrassed at times by a conception of 'Old Testament' history, religion and literature which has hardened into a sort of dogma. They do often, as they are obliged to do, express disagreement with the views of some of the critics, but they seem still to be too much under the spell of a kind of criticism, psychologically unsound and historically perverse, which is becoming every day more and more obsolete. Even the literary criticism of the 'Old Testament,' with its extravagant emendations and reconstructions of the text, has gone widely astray. The Hebrew text is nothing like as corrupt as many of the commentators have supposed. This has been shown clearly by such studies as those of Dr. Samuel Daiches and Dr. I. W. Slotki.[3]

[3] See S. Daiches, *Studies in the Psalms,* Pt. I, 1930; I. W. Slotki, 'Forms and Features of Ancient Hebrew Poetry: A possible aid to the solution of Old Testament difficulties,' in the *Journ. of the Manch. Eg. and Or. Soc.,* No. XVI, 1931, pp. 31-49.

BISHOP HOADLY AND THE NON-CONFORMISTS

By the Rev. J. R. McCallum, M.A., Classical Exhibitioner of Balliol College, Oxford, and formerly Librarian and Tutor of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

BENJAMIN Hoadly was a conspicuous eighteenth century prelate. His life work ran in two main channels, political and religious; in the political arena he served the Whig government in its suppression of the Jacobites and the establishment of the Hanoverian Succession. The interesting contest between the doctrine of 'the Divine Right of Kings' and that of the constitutional authority occupied the political part of Hoadly's career. He exerted an effectual force in securing the establishment of civil liberty against the absolutist claims of the crown. In the religious arena he contended for a policy of conciliation towards the Non-conformists, to whom he steadily commended reunion with the English Church. Here we propose to limit our consideration of Hoadly's activities to a survey of his advances to the Non-conformists. In this sphere Hoadly exhibits a large and reasonable Christian mind, and a sound theory of the nature of the Church. This theory has recently been eloquently presented to English Churchmen in the sermons of Alfred Fawkes, in the little volume entitled *The Church a Necessary Evil*.

Hoadly was born at Westerham, in Kent, on the 14th of November, 1676, and died as Bishop of Winchester 17th April, 1761. After being a tutor at Catherine Hall, Cambridge, he became lecturer of St. Mildred in the Poultry and Rector of St. Peter-le-Poor, Broad Street, London; when, in 1710, the Whigs were, for a time, out of office, Hoadly retired to Streatham, to which rectory he was presented by the Duke of Bedford. But when the Whigs returned to power, at the death of Queen Anne, in 1714, the prelate whose value in combatting Jacobite theory and practice was felt, gained rapid promotion. He was made chaplain to George I in 1715, Bishop of Bangor in 1715; of Hereford in 1721; of Salisbury in 1723; and finally of Winchester in 1734. In accordance with the custom of the times he spent the greater part of the year in London in attendance upon court and parliament.

After the Savoy Conference of 1661, when stringent liturgical obedience was required from the clergy, and some two thousand Puritan ministers refused to give it, Non-conformity became a settled fact. 'All were agreed,' it was reported to the King, 'that unity and peace were ends to be desired; as to the means, they could not come to any harmony.' Repressive legislation soon came. Fines and imprisonment were imposed by the Corporation Act of 1661, the Act of Uniformity of 1662, the Conventicle Act 1664, and the Five Mile Act of 1665 upon religious assemblies contrary to the Prayer Book rule. And the Test Act of 1672 excluded from civil, military, and naval office all who were unwilling to take the oath of allegiance to the crown and receive the Holy Communion according to the rites of the National Church. The Act of Toleration was not quite so liberal as its name suggests, since it only afforded a limited measure of recognition.

A Bill of 1689 for uniting their Majesties' Protestant subjects on terms wherein all the reformed Churches agree, came to nothing, owing to the hostility of Convocation. The only policy left open was to overcome Nonconformist scruples by presenting the English Church as less exclusive than the legislation of the day led Dissenters to suppose. This was the line of advance taken by Benjamin Hoadly. It was not simply an opportunist policy to meet the circumstances. The permanent importance of Hoadly's dealings with the Nonconformist groups is ensured by the grounding of his arguments upon a clearly envisaged concept of the nature of the Church.

We may listen to some of the arguments wherein this able advocate put forth his plea for reasonable uniformity. Here is the famous contention over the question of 'consent' to the Book of Common Prayer in the Act of Uniformity (1662):

> 'For the Act itself applies both these words ["assent" and "consent"] to the *use*, and the *use* only; enjoining the Minister to declare his assent and consent "to the use of all things" in this book. Whoever, therefore, declares his assent to the truth of every proposition in it, and his consent to the use of everything prescribed in it; though he do not do more than he himself may think lawful, yet he certainly does more than the Act requires, and must be at some pains to reconcile it with the intent of the Act plainly declared (*Reasonableness of Conformity*).

The Dissenters had complained of the form of worship and the manner of ceremonial to which they were asked to assent. To this point Hoadly answers by affirming the need for reasonable compromise. If the Nonconformists have their way, how will it be with the worshipper who desires an Anglican use? For example, suppose the morning be set aside for the Holy Communion. The Dissenters may prefer the evening hour. But if the English Church decides for the evening with the Nonconformists, there will still be those who object to the evening and prefer the morning. This applies also to kneeling at the reception of the elements in Holy Communion.

> 'But you may ask: Are you then for no alterations? Yes, I am fully persuaded there may be alterations made for the perfection and advantage of the Church. I profess, I shall always plead for such as are so; and that so much the more, if they be such also as are likely to reconcile any dissenters to it; nay, upon this account I shall plead for such as are *not* so, provided that the Church receives no damage from them. But I cannot argue for any upon such principles as appear to me to tend to absurd, and unreasonable alterations, as well as to those that are reasonable (*Reasonableness of Conformity*).

Infant Baptism, and Episcopacy stuck in the throats of the eighteenth century dissenter. Hoadly proffers the spice to make these not only digestible, but palatable.

> 'The words in the Common Prayer Book I interpret thus: we receive this child into the congregation of Christ's flock, as one who is now a baptized Christian; and, as such, do sign him with the sign of the Cross, to signify that, as he is a Christian, and consequently a servant of Him who died upon the Cross, he is obliged "never to be ashamed of the Faith of Christ crucified . . ." I am not apprehensive that here is any constraint put upon the words, nay, they appear to me to be incapable of any other meaning. Now, as far as I can see, here is not the least tittle of grace attributed to the Sign of the Cross, or to the signing the infant with it. For the thing signified by this signing the child with the Cross is not, as you say, Christ crucified with the benefits of His Cross, but the thing signified by it is, that the infant is a Christian baptized, and, as such, the disciple of a crucified Saviour (*Reasonableness of Conformity*).

But what of the Episcopal form of government? William Law, the High Church non-juror, in his *Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor*, is indignant at Hoadly's contention that a particular order of clergy are not of any necessity. 'For if the Sacrament can only be blessed by God's Ministers, then such ministers are as necessary as the Sacraments themselves.' The Bishop's actual statement to the Dissenters is as follows:

'By Divine Appointment you add yourselves: for all that the sentence, which you quote, says, is that "these Orders [Bishops, Priests, and Deacons] have been in the Church from the Apostles' times'; and all that you can show certainly to be implied in any of the Prayers in the Ordination office is, that "God hath appointed divers Orders of Ministers in his Church. . ." For there is some difference, I think, between these two sentences: "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons are three distinct orders in the Church, by divine appointment," and "from the Apostles' time, there have been these orders in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons"' (*Ibid.*).

A remarkable forecast, though without the buttress of learned research, of the conclusions of Canon Streeter in *The Primitive Church*, with its proof of a diversity in early Church Order!

But let us turn our eye towards the two keenest struggles in the ecclesiastical arena of the day. The first concerned the Presbyterian and Congregational method of election of ministers: the second had to do with sacramental doctrine in the Communion Service. The assertion that episcopacy was neither divinely instituted, nor the only form of Church government, could ease some misgivings. Hoadly, however, does not stop short with his demonstration that lawn sleeves are less imposing than they appear. He sets the issue of Church government to a practical test:

'I must observe to you, that in parishes, and places where the people choose their own ministers, there are the greatest divisions, and quarrels, the greatest feuds and passions remarkable. Nothing hath been the cause of greater variance and strife, and ill-will amongst neighbours, than this choice, and the time of election is commonly the time of heat and anger. . . And from hence it appears that this right is not of such mighty advantage to the Christian Church, or to the people's souls, or of such necessity, that you should be so concerned to maintain the people in the actual exercise of it, and they be so often and vehemently alarmed with the fear of losing it. . . I observe that the Constitution can never be so ordered, or so happily contrived, that every particular Christian shall be under the ministry of the person whom he would choose before all others' (*Ibid.*).

An interesting fact is noted by the Bishop in this connection. Richard Baxter, leader of the Nonconformists at the Savoy Conference (1661), 'had such a sense of the advantages of parochial communion that he advised his people of Kidderminster to attend upon their parish minister, and not to absent themselves from his ministrations' unless he was 'insufficient' to teach them the Christian religion.

Dissenters who were in doubt concerning the doctrine of the Sacrament of Communion held in the National Church could have it in Bishop Hoadly's *Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*. 'The substance of it is what I preached, many years ago, in several sermons, when I had the care of a parish in London.' Hoadly may speak in his own words:

> 'This is particularly to be observed that the whole tenor and form of the institution is in the *figurative* way of speaking. For instance, the Cup, in the words recorded by St. Luke and St. Paul, is allowed not to signify the cup, but the wine in the cup . . . It follows, by all the rules of interpretation agreeably to the way of speaking throughout the whole, that the bread and wine are not the body and blood of Christ, but the memorials of his body and blood.'

Since the bread and wine are figurative reminders of the Saviour, 'the doing of any act in remembrance of a person implies his bodily absence, and if he is corporally present, we are never said to perform that action in order to remember him.' Christ wishes all his friends to remember him in this way. The other views about this matter are criticized by Bishop Hoadly as follows:

> 'They who have attempted to introduce into this rite the natural body and blood of Christ, and a Real Sacrifice of a present body, have not only endeavoured to introduce endless absurdities into a plain duty, but have presumed to destroy, as far as they can, the whole nature and end of our Lord's own institution; and cannot be said to celebrate the Lord's Supper, agreeably to the institution, in remembrance of Christ, but only to act over a ceremony of their own invention, and of quite another sort.'

The reader will have noticed that we took citations from a work by Hoadly entitled *The Reasonableness of Conformity*. It may be asked why a prominent member of the English Episcopate should make communion with the Anglican Church a matter of reasonableness rather than of duty. The authority of the Church, it may be urged, is clear. Those who rebel from it do so at their own risk. But with the Bishop it is a case of: 'Come, let us reason together.' Is not this policy a weakness and a mistake? This brings us to our last point, the theory of the Church which guided Hoadly's interest in Nonconformity. The sermon wherein this was most cogently pronounced was delivered before George the First at the Chapel Royal, St. James', on 31st March, 1717. It was printed afterwards and

started the celebrated Bangorian Controversy, when seventy-four pamphlets were published in July 1717 alone on the question of the authority of the Church.

The subject was *Of the Nature of the Kingdom or Church of Christ*, and the text was taken from *John* xvi, 36: 'My Kingdom is not of this world.' In this treatise Hoadly denied the authority of the Church over the individual conscience. Since the Kingdom or Church of Christ is invisible, no visible Church has any inherent right. Christ is known to His disciples severally in every age. The pivot of Christian authority is the individual. He it is who accepts or rejects Christ. The Church is an association of Christians. It is 'a necessary evil,'[1] which the reasonableness of men recognizes as a method of ordering the Christian conscience in an imperfect world.

> 'As the Church of Christ is the Kingdom of Christ, he himself is King. And in this it is implied that he is himself the sole lawgiver to his subjects, and himself the sole judge of their behaviour in the affairs of conscience and eternal salvation. And in this sense, therefore, his Kingdom is not of this world, that he hath in those points left behind him no visible human authority; no vice-regents who can be said properly to supply his place; no interpreters upon whom his subjects are absolutely to depend; no judges over the conscience or religion of his people. For, if this were so, then the consequence would be that that which retains the name of the Church of Christ would not be the Kingdom of Christ, but the kingdom of those men vested with such authority.'

A modern political theorist, Professor Delisle Burns, has a phrase which elucidates Hoadly's standpoint. 'A sentiment is of no use for the majority,' says Dr. Burns, in his *Political Ideals*, 'unless embodied in an institution.' The National Church is the imperfect institution into which the sentiment of individual responsibility to Christ has been embodied. And the Bishop presses upon his nonconforming brethren this very imperfection as an appeal to the reasonableness of men who are aware of the imperfect and fallible ways of human nature.

> 'Whatever depends so much upon the prudence, and contrivance, of imperfect, fallible, short-sighted creatures, as the constitution of a National Church doth, must, without doubt, have some marks of their imperfection upon it, and cannot be devised so perfect, and complete, that nothing can be added to it, which may be truly said to be necessary to the more general reaching the great ends of religion. It can

[1] See the sermon *The Church a Necessary Evil* in the recently-published volume of sermons by the Rev. A. Fawkes, ed. H. D. A. Major.

> hardly be supposed that such a perfection can be attained in any church on earth, that it may be with truth affirmed that nothing necessary to that end is wanting (*Reasonableness of Conformity*).

In such terms did Bishop Benjamin Hoadly, in the words of Professor Norman Sykes, 'exhort the Dissenters to preserve the unity of the Protestant religion by a full communion with the Established Church; a limited subjection to authority in things indifferent was preferable to the scandal occasioned to religion by the setting up of separate Churches.' Hoadly himself saw an alternative which, in fact, has largely prevailed. It was 'the universal practice of love, and charity, and mutual forbearance, amid our different modes of worship.' Our scope excludes the question of the Re-union of the Anglican Church with the Free Churches. Yet this may be said: The doctrine of Hoadly that religion is a purely personal matter was the basis both of the Wesleyan Movement and of the Evangelical Revival in the English Church, two movements of undisputed and scarcely diminished importance. May not the same seed-plot foster a doctrine of the necessary imperfection of Church Order and worship acceptable to a modern day, when ancient infallibilities are fading, and wholesomely practical in its appeal to the reasonableness of English people?

We do not propose to deal with the famous Bangorian controversy, which originated as the result of Hoadly's sermons delivered in the early years of the reign of George I. An impartial investigation will lead to the conclusion that that controversy was produced by the *odium theologicum* of High Anglicanism, which detested Hoadly's latitudinarian and Protestant affinities, rather than by anything explicitly heretical in Hoadly's pulpit teaching. Hoadly was accused by the Lower House of Convocation of teaching that a man is saved by his sincerity in striving to conform his life to the religion of his choice. This it was argued removed all distinctions between the different religions and left a man free to choose which religion he would. This was not Hoadly's contention, and he rightly complained of misrepresentation. Whilst urging that a man was saved by his sincerity in religious profession, he had strenuously maintained that it is the duty of a man, in making the choice of his religion, to make the most serious and responsible use of his intelligence.

A WHITSUNTIDE SERMON*

'When the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all truth.'—*St. John* xvi, 13.

THE message of Whitsuntide is twofold, first that the Spirit of God is both the spirit of holiness and the spirit of truth, and secondly that that spirit was once actually outpoured upon men in fullest measure. How in face of the facts of life, of what we actually know of the condition and character of human society and of what we know of ourselves, can we reaffirm at any rate the latter part of that message with any confidence and sincerity? We shall all admit at least that it is possible only by a great act of faith. What is there to justify that faith? And by that I mean, what is there in human history to justify it?

For me there is only one fact, which pleads for this belief against all the manifest barbarities, the strictly monstrous cruelties, the insolent and cynical brutalities of history. And that fact is the universality of religion, the fact that wherever man exists, under the most diverse conditions of existing culture or historical antecedents, religion at once appears as an apparently necessary experience of his life. I speak of it now only in its general character as a human experience, for it has such a general character. It always expresses itself in the same way, as the sense of an invisible Presence which terrifies yet allures and fascinates, which calls forth in each the shudder of a boundless awe and reverence, which compels him spontaneously to acts of worship and prayer and sacrifice, which fills him with a strange sense of guilt and with the equally strange feeling of deliverance from guilt. Though terrible, this Presence seems also merciful. Man feels rejected by it as something loathsome, unclean, and yet he feels also that it alone can and will purify him. Everywhere men are found on their knees, uplifting hands and hearts in worship, straining their eyes away from the familiar visible things that are round about them to that invisible Presence which is both within and beyond. That is the fact of primitive

*A sermon preached in Hereford Cathedral by Canon A. L. Lilley on Whit-Sunday, 1932.

religion, and it is a universal fact. No tribe I believe is known to the anthropologist which not only has not its religion but, what is infinitely more important, whose life as a tribe is not perpetuated and preserved by the participation of all its members in the ritual worship of its gods. Now I can only account for this universality of religion in one of two ways. Either religion is an illusion and in that case it is a universal illusion, or it is really the effect of an invisible Reality acting upon men. A universal illusion of exactly the same kind among men divided from all knowledge of one another throughout the whole course of their history seems to me an utterly impossible hypothesis. The fact on the other hand that those inner attitudes and dispositions of men which we call religious and even their outward expressions have a very fundamental similarity, points unmistakably, as it seems to me, to the action upon them all alike of the same invisible Reality.

Now if it is true that all human religion is thus a revelation, a self-disclosure of God, an effect of His Spirit working upon men, we need not be surprised if its first effects bear all the marks of the very primitive types of men who first feel the influence of His Spirit. But what may legitimately surprise us is that their knowledge of God does not under the continued action of that Spirit grow in depth and purity, that their notions of prayer and sacrifice and worship remain undeveloped from their first primitive stage. My own answer to that difficulty is that the natural spiritual development of these early religions is arrested by their entire satisfaction with what they have already learned of God. They do not learn more because they do not feel the need of learning anything more. Such satisfaction always arrests the inner development of religion, resists the further action of the Spirit which leads into all truth. But in our own Sacred Scriptures we have a perfect example of the progressive education of a single people by the Divine Spirit, a people which was so responsive to the teaching of the spirit that it was always passing judgment upon itself if it failed for a moment to respond to the fuller truth into which it was being divinely led. The greatest value of the Old Testament is just that it so forces upon our attention that we cannot possibly escape it, this development from conceptions of the Divine Nature and of the kind of worship which it requires which do not

materially differ from those of primitive tribes to-day up to the sublime monotheism of the prophets and their profound spiritualization of all worship of God. It is in the same way the greatest value of the New Testament that it never for a moment attempts to represent the manifestation of God in Jesus Christ or in the Spirit which came to carry on the work of His earthly life in leading men into the fuller and ever fuller truth of God as a new and distinct revelation, but on the contrary insists throughout that it is just the fulfilment of the prophets. It is the most wonderful thing in the history of religious humanity that these books so widely various in their religious content should have been brought together into one volume and canonized by the Christian Church as the word of God spoken to and for it, His Word throughout preparing the Life in which He could utter the fulness of His redeeming love for men. It is wonderful because they are all so obviously revelational in character. Except in the Wisdom literature there is nothing in the whole Canon of Scripture to which the discursive reason, just coldly reflecting upon even the highest aspects of human nature and life, could of itself have attained. All the rest is a record of what this people felt God had been saying to it and doing for it, or of what He had said to its holiest men. And its form is all revelational. God dictates and pleads in the same breath, bursts out one moment into terrible denunciations, breaks down the next into the tenderest whisper of forgiving love. And man on his side in the very agony of his repentance will remonstrate, appeal from God angry to the God who must be faithful to His promises, will even accuse, as in the case of Job, but will always and above all adore. It is all so obviously the very human translation of Israel's immediate personal contact with God. And yet Israel is learning all the time. The Spirit is leading it onwards into fresh knowledge of God, His character and His ways. Where once Israel had thought to hold God to the point of honour, had required of Him the discomfiture of its enemies because they must also be His enemies, the prophets could see in the national destruction of Israel not only the vindication of God's justice upon His backsliding people, but the more abundant mercy and love towards it of His chastising hand. This is our Bible, the only Word of God which could gather up the whole religious history of humanity into living connection with

its culminating moment in Jesus Christ and present it throughout as revelation, as the Spirit of God so acting upon men's lives as to teach them gradually and as they could receive it their eternal meaning, purpose and destiny.

And the message of Whitsuntide is that this Eternal Spirit is still at its revealing work, revealing ever further depths of the mystery of that redeeming love which was once fully manifested in Christ, revealing it to men on the condition of their faithful response to its operation upon them and just in proportion to the faithfulness of their response. The book of revelation is not closed, can never be closed so long as the spirit of man remains teachable. That is the message of Christ Himself. 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all truth.' When He is come, *i.e.* whensoever and wheresoever your hearts open to His abiding influence, as the flower when its petals open to the sun may perhaps be thinking that the sun which was always there has just suddenly appeared, has for the first time come to it and for its sake only.

A REPUTATION RESCUED

JACOB AND THE KIDSKINS EXPLAINED BY A FORGOTEN PRACTICE.

By J. F. Worsley-Boden, D.Litt.

I.

THE Dean of Saint Paul's, with his customary versatility, covers many themes in his volumes of *Lay Thoughts*,[1] and, with his no less customary penetration, illuminates them all. One chapter, or study, however, wherein he draws from an Old Testament tale not only an obvious lesson in ethics and conduct but a deeper one in mysticism, invites an enquiry. This will be seen to suggest that, while Dr. Inge's conclusion is unexceptionable, his premisses are somewhat precarious.[2] For he appears to assume that the old familiar story of Jacob and Esau in *Genesis* xxvii is, as it reads on the surface, no more

[1] *Lay Thoughts of a Dean*, and *More Lay Thoughts of a Dean*.
[2] *More Lay Thoughts*, 'Esau or Jacob?' p. 61.

than a chronicle of cunning and deceit. To take the story at its face value as the basis of reflections on the 'lay religion of the English gentleman' would no doubt be legitimate enough; but the Dean's argument that Jacob 'outgrew the trickiness of his character' assumes the tale of trickery to be true, and conveys no suggestion that there is in the field another interpretation which may be found to command a large measure of assent.

But Dr. Inge is far from being alone; for the Commentators on this narrative do not appear to have reckoned at all with the possible effect of what Sir James Frazer called 'the battery of the comparative method.'[3] That the story of Jacob and the Kidskins, or the Diverted Blessing, is not an ingenious tale of human trickery there appears to be no hint. Of an alternative explanation in a now unfamiliar primitive practice no indication is offered in Driver's *Genesis*, or in Skinner's *Genesis*, or in Robertson Smith's *The Religion of the Semites*, or in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (arts. *Jacob*, *Esau*, by Dr. Cheyne), or in Peake's *Commentary on the Bible* (v. *Genesis*, by Dr. Peake himself), or in the *New Commentary on the Holy Scripture*, edited by Dr. Gore and others (v. *Genesis*, by the Rev. L. E. P. Erith, M.A.). It may be noted that Robertson Smith connects the kidskins with sacrificial ceremonies (*Rel. Sem.*, p. 467), and so suggests some further meaning beyond the superficial story; and the allegorical treatment of the story goes not unmentioned, as for example in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (14th edition; art. *Genesis*, by Dr. Stanley A. Cook), where it receives a few brief lines. The rivalry of Jacob and Esau is no doubt rightly to be taken to be that of eponymous heroes who in the narrative represent the conflicting claims of Israel and Edom; but this allegory throws no light upon the detailed origin of the story nor explains either its peculiarities or the extreme unlikelihood of the occurrence of the event in the form in which it has been recorded.

II.

The account in *Genesis* xxvii presents Jacob and his mother Rebekah as a pair of cunning deceivers, who trade upon the blindness of the old man Isaac and take a mean advantage of Jacob's older twin brother Esau. By representing himself with the aid of kidskins as Esau, because Esau was a hairy man,

[3] *The Golden Bough*, Preface to Second Edition.

Jacob deceives Isaac, usurps the place of Esau, and secures to himself the blessing of Isaac which is assumed to be intended for Esau, the elder son. And when Jacob has secured the blessing of Isaac, poor Esau comes in from his hunting, brings the gazelle to provide the old man Isaac with his favourite dish of venison, finds himself supplanted, and has to be content with the lesser blessing. So Jacob became Israel, the father of the 'chosen people'; and Esau begat the twelve Dukes of Edom. The story of the Diverted Blessing, told with so much pathos, and impressed by the reiteration of Esau's piteous cry, 'Hast thou but one blessing, my father? Bless me, even me also, O my father,' promotes in the mind of the reader a sense of immense injustice. But when the moralist attempts to draw conclusions in the service of his craft, he is faced by the fact that the low deceiver not only wins the day, but is venerated through succeeding ages as the pious progenitor of the People of God. Surely there must be some alternative interpretation which will remove this contradiction.

Sir James Frazer's *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament* seems to be alone in suggesting that the story of Jacob and Esau is amenable to a perfectly rational explanation, by reference to a practice which is not unknown to students of legal history. The primitive practice of ultimogeniture is seen to throw upon the Genesis story a light which completely transforms the occasion and changes the impression. Yet the original suggestion comes not from Sir James Frazer himself, but from Mr. Joseph Jacobs, who in 1894 espoused the cause of the maligned ancestor of his race and argued that it was not the supposed deceit of Jacob, but the normal practice of succession by the youngest son, which explains the transposition of Esau and Jacob.[4] In view of the opening of this vein of enquiry Sir James Frazer investigates in *Folk-Lore* the traces of this practice of ultimogeniture among various peoples in various times, and finds the signs of it in ancient Israel. The practice was undoubtedly in vogue in ancient time, and indeed has been found surviving even in England in comparatively modern times in the form of what is known as Borough English. In parts of Nottinghamshire this was found side by side with Borough French. Whereas under

[4] v. *Studies in Biblical Archaeology*, 'Junior-Right in Genesis,' quoted in *Folk-Lore*, Vol. I, p. 431.

Borough French descent conformed with the common law and passed through oldest sons, in Borough English it passed through youngest sons; and this has been found on the Saxon Shore, in the Danish towns and on the Celtic fringe. The practice has been noted in France, chiefly in Brittany; in Germany, where the Saxon Law survived; in Friesland, and among the peasants of Russia; and even to this day among primitive tribes in Africa.

In ancient Israel this law of descent was exemplified in the succession of Isaac in place of his older brother, Ishmael (*Genesis* xvi and xxi); and again in the distinction of Benjamin, presumed to be the youngest son (*Genesis* xxxv), in the translation of his name, 'the son of the right hand.' For although the narrative represents Joseph as the favourite, being the son of Jacob's old age (*Genesis* xxxvii, 3), Joseph disappeared and was reported to his father to be dead, leaving Benjamin in apparently undisputed title; but it may be that in fact Joseph was the youngest son, and Benjamin therefore not absolutely the youngest son, but only the youngest surviving son after the departure and supposed death of Joseph. And, again, when at a later stage (*Genesis* xlviii) Jacob blessed the two sons of Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh, he is described as deliberately crossing his hands in order that Ephraim, the youngest son, should receive the right-hand blessing; for when Joseph protested that Manasseh was the first-born, the old man said: 'I know it, my son, I know it; he also shall become a people, and he also shall be great; howbeit his younger brother shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations.' Ultimogeniture appears to have been the consistent practice wherever Jacob was concerned. He inherited by ultimogeniture; he devised by ultimogeniture; he deliberately adopted ultimogeniture in blessing his grandsons, although the chronicler represented them as being placed in such wise that the older should receive the chief blessing. It would seem that the said chronicler, writing at a later date, knew only primogeniture and staged the scene accordingly.

Therefore there would seem to be good reason for supposing that the origin of the account of the supplanting of Esau by Jacob was none other than the consistent fulfilment of the customary practice. The Jewish people evidently outgrew this

practice at an early stage; so that the later writer in the eighth century B.C. being unfamiliar with any practice other than primogeniture, or succession of the oldest son, could explain the tradition which he found among his materials only as an outrageous example of fraud. If there were indeed injustice in the succession of Jacob in lieu of Esau, the injustice lay, on our hypothesis, not in a fraudulent displacement, but in the customary practice by which youngest sons succeeded in the normal course.

III.

If, then, Jacob were the rightful successor of his father Isaac, and the oldest son, Esau, were displaced not by fraud but by the normal process of accepted law and custom, the question arises how and why the practice of ultimogeniture came into existence. Those who desire to study the subject exhaustively cannot do better than turn to Sir James Frazer, pursue it through the pages of *Folk-Lore* (Vol. I, pp. 428-566; Vol. II, pp. 1-39), and further turn up the voluminous authorities to whom the author refers. But in the meantime it may not be unfruitful to attempt to answer these questions briefly with particular reference to the familiar example of Jacob and the Kidskins, or the Diverted Blessing.

There is evidence in antiquity of great jealousy between fathers and sons. Fathers commonly regarded their sons as rivals and slew them. But filicide ceased to be a fashion; and the story of the arrested sacrifice of Isaac in *Genesis* xxii—when Abraham took the knife to slay his son and heard a voice which restrained him, 'Lay not thine hand upon the lad'—is the writer's account of the racial renunciation of this barbarous practice. Dr. M. D. Eder ascribes this habit on the part of fathers to what he calls the 'Abrahamic complex,' in contrast with the Oedipus complex; and sees in the story in *Genesis* 'the primitive filicidal impulse . . . held in check by man's higher control.' 'Again, with profound biological understanding, the myth goes on to explain that if fathers will refrain from killing their sons, the human race will grow to its present numbers, "I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven."'[5] But while the

[5] *Proceedings of the Sexual Reform Congress*, 1929, 'Sterilization of the Unfit,' p. 193.

paternal jealousy ceased to express itself in the murder of sons, it did not cease to function; and it would appear that sons, not less than fathers, manifested some measure of mistrust and independence. As sons grew up, they began to strike out for themselves into the ample and largely uninhabited tracts of No Man's Land, and settle where they would. Finally there would be only one son, the youngest, left at home; and the custom perforce established itself of settling the succession on this youngest son, who was the nearest at hand and the last hope of the family.

Such would seem to be the simple explanation; and the reversal of the practice would seem to be simple too. When the habits of nomadic peoples became more settled and the populations grew, members of families were more inclined to hang together. The whole family lived at closer quarters, and oldest sons were as familiar to their fathers as the youngest; the old distrust which had led to filicide had ceased to be vicious; and once more the oldest son inherited his father's estate as we presume to have been the practice at the first. The eighth century writer of our story lived in this age of recovered primogeniture in Jewry; and, being unaware that any other practice had been in vogue during a long period of the earlier nomadic history, had no alternative but to explain his materials in the light of what he knew.

IV.

Granted this comparatively simple explanation of the story of the Diverted Blessing, it may well be asked: If this succession of the youngest son were normal, why should the story have been told with so much domestic detail and such elaboration of deceit? Did the later writer invent the kidskins? That might seem to credit him with too vast a fund of imagination. No doubt he had considerable material to work upon; and finding the mention of the kidskins as instruments of disguise, he no doubt used them in his narrative in the way which seemed to him most likely to account for their presence in the inherited tradition. To satisfy the condition that the kidskins are ineradicable from the record, a certain slight complication of our first simple solution of the problem will be necessary. Ultimogeniture remains our major premiss; but it is possible, and indeed likely, that the original account came not from the actual age of ultimogeniture,

but from a transitional age in which ultimogeniture was sometimes effected at a father's desire.

This practice of the substitution of heirs is as well attested as that of ultimogeniture proper. Parents would substitute one son for another in the succession by a ceremony of re-birth; so that when it was not the normal practice, ultimogeniture was sometimes adopted. Thus it may well be the case that, whereas the eighth century writer of *Genesis* xxvii employed the kidskins to make Jacob like Esau and so to deceive Isaac, we can recognize their presence in the tradition as indicative of an ancient ceremonial whereby ultimogeniture was effected when it was not the actually established and unquestioned law and custom of the community. In such a case the younger son, on whom the parents chose to settle the succession, was re-born as an animal, and often his mother would pretend to give birth to him a second time. For this purpose an animal would be slaughtered, and both mother and son would be partially covered by the skin and the entrails of the animal; and this ceremony would be used whenever the family wished to make a change in the succession from the normal practice.

Examples of this ceremony of re-birth have been found in the mythology and history of many peoples all over the world; and the practice appears to survive to this day among the religious and social rites of the Akikuyu in East Africa and other tribes. But the classic example comes from Greek mythology, which must be taken as reflecting the practice of primitive peoples. When Hercules was raised to the status of a God, his father, Zeus, required his re-birth. So Hera, the wife of Zeus, but not, as a matter of fact, the mother of Hercules, an amenable creature whom Sir James Frazer calls 'the complacent goddess,'[6] took herself to bed with Hercules in her arms, and went through a burlesque of child-birth by dropping Hercules through her scanty clothing in imitation of the genuine birth of a baby. But elaborate ceremonial is sometimes found to dwindle into a mere shadow of its former self; and, as among the Akikuyu today, so no doubt in ancient time and among the early dwellers in the western East, the placing of skins upon the substituted heir became the sufficient symbol without the ceremony of re-

[6] *Folk Lore*, Vol. II, p. 28.

birth itself. Here, as the alternative to customary ultimogeniture, we have an adopted ultimogeniture as the explanation of the story of Jacob and the Kidskins or the Diverted Blessing. The *Genesis* writer interpreted the signs of an ancient ceremony, with which he was unfamiliar, as the ground of an imaginary story of feminine deceit and filial conspiracy.

V.

The simple rationale of ultimogeniture may seem to have been complicated by the introduction of the account of the ceremony of re-birth; but both are intelligible, and both are seen to be requisite to explain the narrative of the Kidskins and the Diverted Blessing. The established practice of ultimogeniture, and its adoption in cases where it was not the normal practice, are seen further to be not only requisite as an explanation, but sufficient.[7] Thus we may conclude that the story of Jacob and Esau, which according to the Lectionary of the Church of England is read year by year on the Second Sunday in Lent, admits of interpretation as an example of ultimogeniture, possibly in its normal and established form, but more probably by deliberate adoption through a ceremony of re-birth or through some sufficient symbols of such ceremony; and ultimogeniture itself is amenable to a rational and simple explanation. The researches of legal and social history by the comparative method may be said to have exonerated Jacob and his mother Rebekah from the burden of evil reputation; and if we are deprived of the occasion of a homiletic sermon against sharp practice, we have the dual consolation that while we retain a fine old Lesson in Elizabethan English, we need no longer regard the hero of the story and the father of his race as an impostor and a discredit to his children.

[7] Among other but not conclusive explanations which have been offered, it is strictly necessary to note the *Jus Primae Noctis* in its common but erroneous interpretation. The *Jus Primae Noctis* was properly the relaxation of the otherwise enforced abstention from marital relations on the part of married persons on the first night, and sometimes the second and third nights, after marriage. But it has popularly been supposed to mean the title of an overlord to his tenant's daughter on the first night of her marriage. The subject invites a separate essay; but, in brief, even if this last supposition were true, it would account only for the possible bastardy of the first child of the married woman, and would in no wise explain the practice of the succession of the youngest child in cases where there were more than two children of the marriage.

DIVINITY—A PARSON'S EXPERIMENT

By the Rev. W. E. J. Lindfield, M.A., Assistant Curate of St. John's, Kidderminster.

'A SCHOOLMASTER'S dilemma'[1] raises many important questions which fall beyond the range of a short article; but there is one question which calls for consideration before any useful suggestions can be made. Is the subject of Divinity obsolete in itself, and retained in the curriculum only as a concession to custom and tradition, or does the teaching of Divinity too often fail to achieve sound results, because it rests upon an obsolete view of the Bible? A notable 'advancement of learning' has taken place in English secondary schools during the past thirty years; but for some reason, the teaching of Divinity has lagged behind in the race for modern knowledge, and has not shared in this general improvement. Clerical schoolmasters have almost entirely disappeared from secondary schools, and the march of modern progress requires their lay successors to be more concerned with the improvement of the science laboratories than with the study of the Bible. The modern lay headmaster is divided between his conviction that the traditional method of teaching Divinity is old-fashioned and unsatisfactory, and the difficulty of finding a member of his staff with the necessary equipment for teaching the subject on modern lines throughout the school. Moreover, the problem is complicated, both by the diversity and the absence of religious belief which is now common among the pupils of a secondary school. It is not surprising if the headmaster, when faced by such difficulties, feels tempted to allow the Divinity lesson to sink into the background of school life, and to regard the subject as being of dwindling importance for modern education. But such an attitude merely evades the dilemma, and it is clear that some real solution must be found. Either the teaching of Divinity must be completely reformed in accordance with modern knowledge, and brought into line with modern methods of teaching, or it must disappear altogether. The state of indecision which

[1] *Divinity—a Schoolmaster's Dilemma*, by J. H. Phillips. *The Modern Churchman*, May, 1932.

at present exists on the subject in educational circles is typical of the incoherence and spiritual uncertainty in which modern life is involved. The University of Oxford has lately abolished its time-honoured examination known as Divinity Moderations, and has therefore moved in the direction of a 'secular' solution; but a very different outlook was expressed at Oxford by the Vice-Chancellor of Birmingham University at the centenary meeting of the British Association last year. In his presidential address to the Education Section, Sir Charles Grant-Robertson said:

> 'The aid that our educational system can increasingly give to this complicated social and economic transformation is being limited, because we have refused to solve the fundamental problem of religious instruction, and have refused to allocate to institutional religion its harmonious place in the task of training for life. Until we have done that, no matter how scientifically planned may be our educational machinery, there will be a steady flow of grit clogging the gears.'

If the traditional way of teaching Divinity is unsatisfactory, it is probable that the 'secular' solution (*i.e.* abolition) will be found to be still more unsatisfactory, and that the only true solution will be found along the pathway of reform. No teacher of geography in these days would think of confining his instruction to a desultory description of the earth's surface, with the aid of an antique map of the world on Mercator's projection. The study of Divinity must likewise go beneath and beyond the surface of the text of Scripture, for the unexamined Bible is not worth teaching. The first step in any advance of method is to recognize the fact that Divinity is a subject with its own body of expert knowledge, and its appropriate method of study, with which the teacher should become acquainted before he may venture to teach the subject profitably. It may not be an easy matter to find such a teacher; but there seems to be no reason why the clergy and Free Church ministers should not be allowed to make some contribution to the solution of this problem. In one ancient Grammar School this has been done, and the present writer has the privilege of being an honorary visiting teacher of Divinity. The experiment, which has been at work for some time, appears to have been of definite help to the school, and certainly of great encouragement to the teacher concerned.

Even if this solution is not possible, there is little need for detailed advice on the teaching of Divinity, since there is abun-

dant material of a practical kind ready to the teacher's hand. The Cambridgeshire Syllabus, which contains an admirable article on 'The Teaching of Religion,' and an extensive bibliography, points the way to better things in Scripture teaching. *The Little Bible* (Oxford University Press, 2/6), with its excellent 'Appendix for Teachers and Parents,' or *A Shorter Bible*, compiled by the Bishop of Liverpool and others (Blackwell, 2/6 to schools) will be found very useful and quite sufficient for junior forms. For senior boys, a book such as Dr. T. R. Glover's *The World of the New Testament* (Cambridge University Press, 6/-) will throw a most interesting light upon the Greek, Roman and Jewish setting of primitive Christianity. Dr. Edwyn Bevan's delightful volume on *Christianity* in The Home University Library is a book to be read by all teachers of Divinity.

The chief fault of the old method of teaching arises from the obsolete view, which regards every book of the Bible as complete and self-contained. The difficulty and dullness which often surround the teaching of Divinity will disappear when this practice of reading 'set books' is given up. The Old Testament in particular should be studied in the light of the development of the Hebrew idea of God, the Synoptic Gospels should be read comparatively, and *The Acts of the Apostles* should be read, not chapter by chapter, but as a guide to the Epistles of S. Paul. These in turn should be studied mainly for the light which they throw upon the daily life and difficulties of the primitive Church. It is a good plan, for example, to take certain leading problems of the Christian Mission—the contradiction of a Crucified Messiah, the admission of the Gentiles, and the apostasy of the Jews, the problems of slavery, of Church and State, and of the Second Coming of Christ, and to find the various answers which are given to them in the New Testament. In the writer's opinion, it is also a mistake to suppose that S. John's Gospel cannot be faithfully and reverently taught in a class-room. If we keep in mind the words of the Dean of S. Paul's, that S. John's portrait of Christ is 'the idealization of a historical figure,' we shall find that this is the easiest of all the Gospels to teach, and that it makes a great appeal to older schoolboys. But even this great work should not be regarded as 'self-contained,' and should be

studied in connection with the considerable body of New Testament writings emanating from, and addressed to the Church at Ephesus. The wonderful story of the Raising of Lazarus, for example, when read in the light of *Ephesians* ii (with which it seems to be doctrinally connected) yields not only a difficult account of the revival of a corpse, but also a true account of the reviving grace of the Christian Gospel in the life of the typical Gentile convert 'dead in trespasses and sins,' for whom the orthodox Jew wept in vain. At first sight, such an interpretation may appear to be strained; but at least it has the merit of being as old as S. Augustine.[2]

Finally, it must be said that not even the whole body of Divinity should be regarded as 'self-contained.' It may be a good plan to read the Bible merely as 'good literature'; it is a better plan to endeavour to explain some of the technical difficulties of modern criticism by recourse to rough analogies in English Literature. The composite authorship of the Book of Genesis, for example, may be illustrated by reading a few lines of *The Knight's Tale*, and then turning at a convenient point, from the crabbed style of Chaucer to the smooth paraphrase by Dryden. An intelligent VIth Form boy readily joins in this kind of 'detective' work, and he quickly grasps the fact that the later sources of the Pentateuch have much the same relation to the earlier sources as that which Tennyson's *Idylls of the King* bear to Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*. He soon learns to appreciate the fact that the Deuteronomic and Priestly narratives possess a value of their own as later interpretations of Hebrew history and Jewish religion and ethics, and that for a clearer exposition of their doctrinal background, we must go to the Psalms. He will agree that our enjoyment of *Julius Caesar* is not impaired because we cannot believe that Mark Antony's famous speech is a faithful translation of a Latin original, but is, in fact, unhistorical.

It is along such lines as these that the movement for 'brighter Divinity' should proceed, so that the Holy Scriptures may again become, in the words of S. Athanasius, 'a sacred school of the knowledge of God, and of the daily life of the soul' (*De Incarnatione*, xii, 5).

[2] Trench: *Notes on the Miracles*, 7th ed., 1862, p. 426.

SOME PROBLEMS OF DIVINITY TEACHING

By the Rev. W. H. Oldaker, M.A., a Chaplain of Clifton College.

SCHOOLMASTERS are sometimes faced by dilemmas, but fortunately they are not always of the magnitude of that described in the *Modern Churchman** for May, from which even twenty-nine Joshuas are unable to deliver its victim.

In that turmoil of confusion which characterizes modern popular thought upon religious matters, the young are tremendously interested, and if they want the man who sits in front of them wearing a gown and wielding a piece of chalk to commit himself about anything, it is about miracles. Miracles are the first difficulty that they come up against as soon as they begin to think at all why they read the Bible, and why they attend chapel (if they do) once a day and twice, or even thrice, on Sundays. They have a tremendous respect for the adult mind : even the adult minds of those whom they see so often as their schoolmasters. The interest is almost pathetic. Can we let our hungry sheep look up and not feed them?

Of course the Authorized Version is of first-rate literary interest, but in the public school English is still a sort of Cinderella in the curriculum, allowed a grudging two periods a week. But after all there is more in the Old Testament than the literary interest of a classical translation : especially when some parts of it, important sections of the Prophets among them, are in that version almost incomprehensible. It will be wiser, then, to use the Revised Version in the Divinity class.

To the question whether we are to study the Old Testament or the New, there can be only one answer : study both. Even if there is only one Divinity period a week, read them alternate weeks. To a Christian, the Old Testament is a pagan record unless it be interpreted in the light of the New. If we read the Psalms and find imprecations upon the authors' enemies, with fiery requests to Jehovah to break their teeth in their mouths, or to let the tongues of their dogs be red with their blood, we

* P. 82 *ff*, 'Divinity—a Schoolmaster's Dilemma.'

can turn to the Gospels and find a command to love our enemies and do good to them that hate us. When the Psalmist says that in the name of the Lord he will destroy his foes, or when we find Samuel (a savage old man in many ways) hewing Agag in pieces before the Lord, we can contrast that with One who said, 'Father forgive them, for they know not what they do': or with a martyr who followed his Master's example and prayed that the sin of his murderers should not be laid to their charge. The fate of those nasty little boys (they have their modern counterparts) who 'ragged' Elisha about his bald head, and he cursed them, and bears ate them up, had its didactic value for an older generation. 'That is what will happen to you if you are rude to God's prophets.' It is more effective to-day to contrast Christian with Old Testament ethics, than to teach Old Testament ethics unless we exhibit their defective character. 'It was said to them of old time, but I say unto you.'

The book of *Genesis* is another difficulty in Divinity. Did God really make the universe and all in it in six days? It was a Jewish theory that He did so. But those who know the first chapter so rarely read on to the fourth verse of the second chapter of the book; if they did, they would find another theory of creation inconsistent with the first, put side by side by the man who pieced the book together, and so left by him, unharmonized, because harmony was not necessary or expected. Yet the essential facts remain: God did create the world and all in it: and the process of creation is far better explained to simple people, if it can be explained at all, in the language of poetry than in the language of science.

No one denies the difficulty of teaching Divinity. We who teach have a tremendous responsibility. If our pupils find later on in life that we have taught them anything which they have got to unlearn, anything which is not true, it comes as a great shock to them. Probably more souls have been lost to the Church from this cause than from any other. If we teach them that God is a Great Spy, anthropomorphic notions of God based on Old Testament writings, they are bound to find out sooner or later that He is nothing of the sort. Indeed they need not look further than the Gospels to do so. They need only to kneel down at their bedside and say 'Our Father.'

The Old and the New Testaments are so interdependent that to omit either must impoverish our religious education. The Hebrew people had to learn what God was like, even as we have to learn it. They learned gradually, taking centuries in the process. When their minds were ready for the final revelation, Jesus was sent among them: Who told them, as He tells us, what God is like. No Christian can teach the Old Testament without reference to its fruition in the New. Nor can the pupil understand the New Testament without reference to the *praeparatio evangelica* in the Old. Who can really understand Jesus without a study of the Law, and the Prophets, and the Psalms?

We must teach nothing that our pupils will have to unlearn later in life. Apart from that, I have sometimes wondered whether the point of view from which we teach them matters very much, provided we teach in all sincerity. Boys (and girls too, I suppose, though I write with less experience of girls) are such good judges of sincerity. The human mind works in strange ways, and if the teacher is open-minded and honest, it is always possible that he may find himself being taught by his pupils before he does too much harm to their immature minds.

There is one aspect, however, of the Divinity difficulty which headmasters, if not their assistants, have to face; but it is not really a dilemma, because instead of being forced unwillingly to choose one horn or the other, one wants to choose both: and that is impossible. Ought a school, in these present times, to yield to those who say that Divinity is as much a specialized subject as Science or Mathematics or Modern Languages; or ought the older system, by which it was taught as a form-subject by the same man who teaches Latin and English and perhaps History, to be preferred? There seems to be much to be said for both. The critical knowledge of both Old and New Testaments has grown to such enormous proportions in the last half-century, that at first sight it might seem as if the specialist alone should teach it, yet, as the author of *Ecclesiastes* nearly said, 'Of making *little* books there is no end.' There are so many good commentaries and aids to the study of the Bible, in small compass, that, manifold as are the demands upon a schoolmaster's time, no one need find himself unable to prepare a weekly or bi-weekly lesson. Of course, a specialist will teach it better. But if Mr.

So-and-so does not teach Divinity, the implication at once, in the pupils' mind, is that Mr. So-and-so either does not understand it himself, or has no wish to do so: and Mr. So-and-so may be a person of much greater influence than the Divinity teacher: it happens sometimes. The older type of schoolmaster still wants to teach Divinity, and very well and reverently many of them do it. The demand that they shall not teach it comes rather from the younger members of the staff. It is certainly hard to have to say to a man, 'You are to teach your form this book': but probably the best thing for that man would be for him to study the book he is to teach as thoroughly as possible. To refuse to teach it, because you know nothing about it, is even in this subject, a confession of failure. I was once discussing this matter with a schoolmaster now retired, and he put the matter with a Johnsonian simplicity: 'If a man is not fit to teach Divinity, he is not fit to teach anything.'

It is not denied that it may often be more convenient to have every form-master teaching Divinity. Exigencies of the time-table may demand that the subject should be taught on one or two days of the week, Saturday or Sunday, or both. A chaplain, if there be one, and if he is to teach only Divinity, must take the whole week visiting different forms, and this means complicating the time-table.

Perhaps I may sum up by saying that it is of first importance that Divinity be taught reverently and with sincerity: if this does not seem possible of attainment by the whole staff, then a selection from the staff must be made and the subject must be put into competent hands.

I suppose there is no subject which has provoked so much discussion of recent years as education: and religious education is the cause of more argument than any other branch of education. Yet is the distinction really valid? Is not all education really religious education? Education is the process of opening the eyes, and if we open our eyes far enough we shall see God. It is possible to conduct even a Latin lesson in a reverent and God-fearing manner. And if a Latin lesson, *a fortiori* a Divinity lesson. The religious tone of a school depends on much besides its Divinity lessons, but to make the teaching of Divinity sincere and reverent may do much to make religion a real influence in the daily life of a school.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE SONGS OF THE CHURCH*

So far as the ordinary church-goer is concerned, it matters little what kind of Prayer Book is used in church: those who listen to the words, when, indeed, they are audible, are but a small minority. That which does really tell in the service is the quality of the sermon and of the hymns. The whole balance and trend of the service can be altered, the whole effect ruined, by poor sermons and feeble hymns. It is difficult to alter the sermon. The poor preacher, over fifty, as he is, on the average, must be tolerated and not thoughtlessly shot. The hymns, however, we can and should be able to alter, and what infinite harm is done by feeble, false and futile words, and sugary and sentimental airs. Hymns affect people's religious life far more than sermons. Sermons 'fly forgotten as the dream dies at the opening day': but hymns and hymn tunes dance round in your head: you cannot forget them, try as you will, and the deplorable theology of many a simple good man is the result of hymns. Hell is indeed paved with well-intentioned hymns and tunes. Dr. Dearmer has given many notable gifts to the Church already, but *Songs of Praise* is perhaps his greatest. I believe this book will really give to the ordinary Christian a better and healthier outlook on religion than any volume of sermons or broadcast addresses could ever achieve. One great merit I believe it possesses is that it may well be a great agent in promoting unity in the Church. It ought to appeal strongly to Free Churchmen as well as to Anglicans. It also will, I believe, be as popular in schools and colleges as it will be, I am sure, in Church. I believe I am right in saying that several hundred thousand copies have already been bought by Education Committees.

One great merit this book seems to me to possess is that it is definitely a book of Praise. The tone of rejoicing, of confident trust, is a mark of the book, and there is a notable absence of the fawning, clinging and whining attitude, so characteristic of the pietist hymnals.

It is a very great boon to have the words of our great classical English poets for the first time included in any number in a hymn book. To sing great poetry, and have it stored in the memory is a very great blessing in one's life.

In so many Churches, one dreads the approach of Lent, for the drab and doleful doggerel that one has reason to expect. Those who use this book will have no cause to dread Lent. Again, in how many Churches one can find no hymn to sing which emphasises international brotherhood or Christian social aspiration. This book abounds in these hymns, of the noblest and best kind.

Some people will think that their old favourites have been needlessly omitted, but, except in the case in which a favourite ought not to be a favourite to anyone who really cares for truth, I do think that there are very few old favourites which will not be found here. If I were asked to criticise the book adversely, I should say that, out of 700 hymns, I think I could find a hundred which I should never wish to sing: but probably there are numbers of people who like these hymns which I myself should with pleasure delete. I think there are several very modern tunes which I myself cannot understand, and indeed actively dislike, but here again it may be because I belong to a semi-defunct generation. I do not think that the

* *Songs of Praise.* Enlarged Edition. (Oxford University Press: Revised 1932. 6/-.)

almost impossible task of finding a hymn for every Saint's Day has been very successfully mastered. Is it really a task worth attempting?

Beyond these few criticisms, I find myself an enthusiastic admirer of the book. I have used it for nearly a year in Church, and have had not one objector and very many admirers: I have used it for nearly a year in the village school, and find the children love it, and, when offered a choice, nearly always choose the new hymns. Now that this book is coming into use at St. Martin-in-the-Fields, and in so many other well-known Churches, it will, I am sure, be soon welcomed in all Churches where there is a belief that we should sing with the understanding.

May I add that I myself got one person to give me all the books I needed, with the help of the liberal grant from the publishers, and I succeeded in inducing various members of the congregation to give it as a Christmas present to one another.

Let anyone who gets this book be sure that they ask for the enlarged edition.

I cannot end without saying how well worth while I think it has been to include some of Dr. Dearmer's own hymns, and much Dr. Vaughan Williams and Dr. Martin Shaw are to be congratulated for their share in this admirable work for English-speaking Christianity. H.A.

AN ANGLICAN ELMER GANTRY

The novel and the play are, with the possible exception of the wireless, the most influential vehicles of moral and religious teaching to-day. The sermon in Church and the article in the religious magazine sink into insignificance beside them. Mr. J. C. Hardwick, widely known as a religious publicist, has turned to the novel to give publicity to his criticism of some features of English Church life. In *A Professional Christian,** he provides for his readers a picture of Church life not as it might be, or as it ought to be, but as, too often, it is. The scene of action is cast in post-war times, and Crewe, the hero or villain of the story, is a demobilised temporary officer who passes through Knutsford, Keble, and Cuddesdon to Holy Orders. The author is careful to state in a preliminary note that, while many of the incidents recorded are authentic, the characters are imaginary. No doubt they are imaginary in the sense that no one of them is an exact portrait of any living ecclesiastic; nevertheless they are all typical. The tutor of Carpenter Hall who said to his pupils, 'While it is the duty of every curate to preach well, it is not the duty of any curate to preach better than his vicar,' will not be impossible of identification, and so also the Principal of Harlaxton Theological College who was in the habit of dividing his students into three classes. 'First came those who were genuinely devout and unworldly; then those who honestly thought themselves both devout and unworldly; and finally those who neither were, nor thought themselves to be, devout and unworldly.'

The besetting sin of the satirist is caricature, and the tone of this book is dominantly satirical, yet it may be rightly claimed that Mr. Hardwick's characters are not caricatures, and that the incidents come well within the range of probability.

Crewe is the son of a successful pork butcher in a small Yorkshire town. He is possessed of strong common sense and sound judgment. In-

**A Professional Christian.* By J. C. Hardwick. (Published by Jonathan Cape: 1932. Price 7/6.)

tellectually he is mediocre, but is hard-working and methodical. He is of good appearance, and several years of war service do much to educate him socially. Having been a Dissenter, he becomes a loyal and whole-hearted Anglican. Without moral blemish, he is devoid of chivalry, idealism, and spiritual depth.

'Not a good man, not a bad man,
Not a man at all, one fears,
If the man be that within us,
Which is born of fire and tears.'

His motives for seeking Ordination are mixed, but they are all selfish. They may be summed up in his declaration to his friend Curtiss :

'I want to succeed in the Church; otherwise I would never have gone in for it. And I would sacrifice a good deal for success.'

By various means, all of them, as we have remarked, well within the bounds of probability, he works his way up the ecclesiastical ladder and secures a desirable benefice, a most suitable wife, an excellent reputation with the Church authorities, and quite good prospects of a bishopric in the near future.

Crewe has two friends who are his contemporaries at Oxford ; they also take Holy Orders. The one, Curtiss, is an ardent Anglo-Catholic ; the other, Culpepper, is an ardent Modernist. They belong to Merton and Balliol respectively, and pass on to two well-known theological colleges in Oxford. Though single-minded, hard-working, and highly intelligent, promotion does not come their way. This seems to be due to two main reasons : (1) They are not self-seeking and do not plan their activities so as to secure promotion ; (2) they are not standardized Churchmen, and each possesses a healthy spirit of independence. Tennyson's farmer-churchwarden, when giving advice to the curate, says : 'Creep along hedge-bottoms, and thou'lt be a bishop yet.' Suppleness in men of mediocre ability is needful for the postulant for ecclesiastical promotion. Men of supreme ability or of great social and political influence may dispense with it. Curates should bear this in mind. Of course, a clergyman can have a very useful life in Holy Orders and a very happy one without promotion. Whether in slums or in isolated country parishes, many clergymen of this single-minded, unworldly type are found. We could wish that Mr. Hardwick had found it possible also to include this aspect of clerical life.

This story is as true to life and is as sordid as is Zola's *La Terre*. It is not the kind of book to commend to Sunday School teachers or to young people. Many curates, however, might read it with advantage, especially that section of the story which deals with unprofitable curates.

H.D.A.M.

THE INDISPENSABILITY OF LAYMEN*

There are certain catch-phrases which convey a quite erroneous conception but which are most difficult to slay. It is still common to hear Baptism and Confirmation referred to in terms of 'being done' ; and the fact that this suggests a process of vaccination rather than dedication is of more than passing significance, since undoubtedly the impression is widespread that Baptism is a kind of insurance against risk. So, too, what can be done with the phrase 'Going into the Church' as descriptive of Ordination? Here again the phrase might not matter did it not carry with it the

* *Liberating the Lay Forces of Christianity*. By J. R. Mott. (S.C.M. : 1932. Price 4/- and 2/6.)

implication that all that the Church stands for is the concern of the parson rather than the concern of the laity.

This misconception is very deep. Perhaps Anglicanism has erred more deeply than the Free Church systems in creating a gulf between parson and layman and in failing to give adequate scope to the interest and enthusiasm of the latter. No doubt recent developments have done much to revive lay interest in the machinery of Church government; but there is still a sting in the criticism that we tend to encourage our Church organizations to rely on clerical nursemaids. The criticism is a little unkind, and also unjust, but there is just enough truth in it to make it bite. The laity do, as a rule, rely far too much on their clergy, and we have been content to have it so.

Dr. Mott has just written a challenging book on the subject of lay-work in the Christian Church. He points out that in the early expansion of Christianity, lay witness was predominant. As recorded in Acts viii, 'The disciples went everywhere preaching the word . . . except the apostles,' which can be taken epigrammatically as showing the enthusiasm with which the laity forced the pace in a preaching campaign. To be a convert was to be a missionary; witness was an inner necessity laid on each Christian of sharing his good news; he 'could not but speak' his experience. And not only in the first age. Dr. Mott traces the difference which it has made whenever the laity have effectively fulfilled their part. 'Martyrs, monks and Methodists' have had a preponderatingly lay element; and the high-tide of their influence has coincided with the creative periods in the life of the Church. In his own inimitable way, Dr. Mott passes from century to century, and country to country, bringing the work of this and that layman to light and showing how immensely important that work has been. Moody, for example, remained a layman all his life, and, 'judged by every test he was the chief evangelist of modern times. . . . Many who are now pillars in the Churches of England, Scotland, Canada and the United States were converted in his meetings. While he preached a pronouncedly individualistic Gospel, he was also true to its social implications. Few men, laymen or clergymen, have more mightily shaken the social conscience' (p. 43).

There is a reason why lay-work has been so prominent among the Free Churches. More than others, they have stressed the universal priesthood of all believers as the cardinal doctrine of the modern Church. Dr. Mott analyses the 'vital results of the priesthood of all believers' as follows:

1. It removes the misconception that the ministry has a knowledge of divine things peculiar to itself and an experience of Christ different from that of the laity.
2. It leaves no ground for doubt that the layman, as well as the minister, has a vivid consciousness that God Himself has given him his work.
3. It places upon the entire membership of the Christian community the responsibility for the expansion of Christ's Kingdom.
4. It ensures the full impact of the entire Christian community upon the non-Christian world.

But Dr. Mott's work is more than analysis and criticism. The last 50 pages are full of practical hints about the kind of work which the laity ought to be encouraged to do, and suggestions as to how they might be persuaded to do it. 'It is said our Lord sought His disciples and they fol-

lowed Him. Although, happily, laymen sometimes volunteer to help, they more often hesitate to take initiative. The minister takes the initiative and seeks out laymen for unattempted and for unfinished tasks; he does not wait for them to come forward and offer their services. The minister must also plan the campaign and give the signals' (p. 114). Incidentally, this provides an answer to a criticism which previous pages suggested. Dr. Mott gave the substance of this book as a series of lectures to students—presumably laymen—of an American Divinity School. Hence it is essentially an appeal to lay people to use their enthusiasm as active workers for Christ: only secondarily is it an appeal to ministers to evoke that enthusiasm. Consequently, it lays little stress on that careful direction and guidance which lay enthusiasm always needs. Not that we have in mind stereotyping enthusiasm, but rather guiding it towards effective expression. The Anabaptist Movement is quoted by Dr. Mott as an example of the effectiveness of lay enthusiasm; but it is well known that it was full of dangerous abuses and excesses. It lacked the guidance of trained leaders experienced in planning a campaign and organizing the enthusiasm of the campaigners.

There is a similar danger to-day. It is a most welcome fact that the laity are taking an increasingly wider share in the work and witness of the Church. There seems little doubt that the Spirit of God has been at work, using new methods or reviving old ones, in various movements up and down the country. People are regaining the power to witness because they have an experience worth witnessing to. But there is a danger of enthusiasm running amok unless it can be guided by trained and experienced leadership. The Church needs all of the enthusiasm and co-operation of the laity which it can muster; but enthusiasm which lacks the background either of wisdom or theology which a trained mind can provide is always liable to bring the Simons of this world first to amazement and then to perdition. That is why the clergy must remain in a real sense leaders, though they need not be nurse-maids, and must not be tyrants.

This is less a criticism of Dr. Mott than of an impression which might be gained from his book. We will only add that this is an excellent and stimulating work. Every parson would do well first to read it himself and then to pass it on to the members of his Church Council.

J. P. Hodges.

AN INTERPRETATIVE COMMENTARY*

There ought no longer to be any complaint about the shortage of Commentaries on the books of the Bible: the only difficulty is that of choosing the one most suitable to particular needs. Packard on St. Luke's Gospel is written by a School Chaplain; obviously, it has specially in view the needs of a school—both of pupil and of master—but it is also suitable for the average reader who desires something to heighten his interest in what he reads but not to distract him by the discussion of minor details. It contains the author's translation of the text on one side of the page and his comments on the opposite one. The subject-matter is divided up under good and suitable headings, and these form a very useful synopsis of the Gospel. The commentary is scholarly and interesting, and, while the writer states that it is 'not so much critical as interpretative,' many will find his quiet Modernist intepretations often helpful and sometimes illuminating. He is not afraid to say of Luke viii, 46, 'It seems incredible that Jesus

* *A Running Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke.* By E. W. S. Packard, Chaplain of Sedbergh School. pp. 217. (S.C.M.: 1932. Price 5/- and 3/6.)

should have used the words "I knew that power had gone out of me," as though automatically a reservoir had been tapped. It is the language of magic. . . . The words are inconsistent with the saying that follows, which is unmistakeably Jesus' own, "It is your faith that has saved you." Had they understood these words they would have seen that Jesus was deliberately seeking to correct a misunderstanding. It was not just magic which had arrested the haemorrhage; it was an act of faith—an act of allegiance to Someone who had the power and the will to heal her.' At the same time, his interpretation is characterized by a wise reticence which does much to commend it. Of the incident concerning the Gerasene demoniac he writes: 'What connection the healing of the demoniac had with the stampede of the swine must remain a mystery—and a fascinating one. Was there any connection, or was it a mere coincidence misinterpreted by superstitious minds? We do not know.' J.P.H.

CHRISTIAN THOUGHT*

Prof. McGiffert, whose works are well known to English students, and who has now retired from the Union Theological Seminary, New York, has undertaken another work on the history of Christian thought. It is promised to extend to three or more volumes, of which this is the first. It covers the period from the earliest days to the time of Irenaeus, and then is confined to the development of thought in the Eastern Church (except in the chapter on the Monarchians) from Clement of Alexandria to John of Damascus. The book does not claim to be a new contribution, and is not written for specialists.

Prof. McGiffert seems to hold the balance between the controversies which have arisen about the Gnostics; he thinks that they were not primarily philosophers, though he seems to accord them a greater right to that title than would the majority of modern scholars. He emphasizes the connection between them and the thought of Paul, and points out the differences, though without noting the important difference between their dualism and that they are alleged to have inherited from the Apostle. He shows that the Apostolic Fathers were concerned with the conditions of Christian salvation and its nature; of this they had no developed theory, which is not surprising as their main thought was that salvation was conditioned chiefly by the keeping of God's new Law. Herein they differ from Paul, John, Ignatius and the Gnostics, for whom Christianity was a mystery-religion. In treating of the Apologists, Prof. McGiffert allots twenty-four pages to Justin and to others eleven pages. Though they shared the life and worship of the Church, they thought of Christianity as 'simply universalised and denationalised Judaism'; but as none of them regarded the Mosaic Law as still binding, Christianity was for them a universal religion 'as old as the creation, of which the Hebrew prophets were the great teachers, and whose tenets were God the moral ruler of the world, virtue his will, and future rewards and punishments.' Two chapters are devoted to Irenaeus and his work, and the first part of the book closes with an exposition of Montanism.

The chapters in the second part treat of Clement of Alexandria, Origen, The Doctrine of the Trinity (which sets forth the teaching of Athanasius), The Nicene Council and After, The Doctrine of the Person of Christ, Dionysius the Areopagite, and John of Damascus, who receives rather full treatment because of his permanent influence on the Eastern Church. Prof.

* *A History of Christian Thought.* By Arthur Cushman McGiffert. (Scribners: 1932. Price 12/6.)

McGiffert does well to note that though the Monophysites are known as heretics, their theological position 'was substantially identical with that of Cyril and the Alexandrian Church of his day'; indeed, he might have added that, to those who used terms in the sense put upon them by the Monophysites, the formula 'two natures in Christ' not only appeared Nestorian but was so. He regards the victory of Chalcedon as 'political rather than theological,' and again he might have added that the Monothelite controversy showed that the victory was mainly verbal. But Prof. McGiffert is content for the most part to tell the story objectively, and does not pass many judgments upon it. His summary is one which will certainly become increasingly to be accepted in the modern world. He writes:

> 'With the Council of Chalcedon a compromise was reached which permanently clouded the issue. Thenceforth the controversy was devoid of reality not simply because politics entered into it but also and chiefly because it had to do with metaphysical subtleties which mattered not at all either religiously or ethically.
>
> 'The controversy had not even the interest which to-day at any rate attaches so largely to psychological discussion, for in spite of appearances it had to do exclusively with ontology. The problems involved were as ontological indeed as those connected with the doctrine of the Trinity. Given a being possessed both of the infinite nature of God and the finite nature of man, how is he to be conceived? The problem is not psychological, for there are no data either for introspection or behaviour to go upon. The problem is metaphysical and purely speculative. Except by those interested to trace the formation of the particular dogmas involved, the whole Trinitarian and Christological development might be dismissed as unworthy of notice were it not for the profound religious difference that underlay it and to which reference has already been made. In this difference were rooted two diverse types of religious life, one of which has chiefly, though not exclusively, characterized the east, the other the west. Because of this greater issue the controversies that have been sketched were of more significance than might appear.'

Prof. McGiffert's expositions of the thought of leading Christians are plentifully illustrated by quotations from their works. He has avoided technical language as far as possible, and his aim at clarity and simplicity has been attained, though he has not attempted popularisation in a sense which would sacrifice the interests of students, who should find the book, from Chapter IV onwards, a valuable introduction to the history of Christian thought. The weakness of the book is its beginning. Only twenty-nine pages are given to relating the teaching of Jesus and Paul; in my judgment they are superficial and quite unworthy of the author's great learning. They take for granted a very negative criticism of the Gospels which rests upon assertions rather than upon reason or proof; and it is effrontery to apply the description on the dust-cover, 'brilliant and authoritative history of Christian thinking,' to this brief section of the book. There is little more than an archaic interest in following the subsequent history of Christian thought if its historical foundations were really what is told in these pages. Whatever value modern and future theology may find in the Christian thought of the past, the elements of permanent worth are far more likely to be found in the Gospels and the Pauline epistles than in the works of any of the other writers so ably outlined in this book.

J. S. Bezzant.

CORRESPONDENCE

DIVINITY—A SCHOOLMASTER'S DILEMMA.

SIR, To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

What exactly are we to gather from Mr. J. H. Phillips' article on Divinity teaching in schools? Is the conclusion that religious teaching to intelligent boys is now impossible, or are we to reflect on the presumption of many schoolmasters who undertake the most important of all subjects without training and without preparation?

Mr. Phillips is no doubt familiar with many modern books published to help the schoolmaster. But how many trouble to read them? No doubt it is easier to order '29 Joshuas,' or to fill the inkpots.

Jesus College, Cambridge. P. GARDNER-SMITH.

SIR,

The article in the *Modern Churchman* for May makes melancholy reading. Perhaps a few happier recollections of school divinity lessons may be permitted by way of contrast. There must be a good many still living who, like myself, can remember Whitelaw's Monday morning lectures on St. Paul's Epistles in the XX at Rugby. Layman as he was, he had obviously taken immense pains, and if much of what he said was beyond us, at least no boy could fail to be struck by his enthusiasm for his subject. St. Paul and Sophocles were the two teachers who drew him out most, and we learned, however dimly, that both were great men. In some of us, and those not only boys of an ecclesiastical turn of mind, he kindled an interest and love for St. Paul that have been life-long. Faintly also I remember some very different lessons at a private school, when the form master took *Judges*. He seemed to show us that primitive people cannot be expected to have the same standard of right and wrong as ourselves, but that everyone has some standard, not a bad lesson for boys. W. BARTLETT.

Helmdon Rectory, Northamptonshire.

DEAR SIR,

I have just read the amusing but heartbreaking article by Mr. Jack Hood Phillips in the May number of the *Modern Churchman,* and wonder that schoolmasters find such difficulty in selecting books for 'Divinity' lessons after the years of effort given by the late Canon M. G. Glazebrook (Headmaster of Clifton) to put in readable English for masters and boys alike the best results of modern scholarship. I know he much hoped that his 'Studies in the Book of Isaiah' (Clarendon Press, 1910) would be useful for the upper forms in our Public Schools, and I testify that my niece used it in teaching 'Israel' to a class in the Jerusalem Girls' College, which comprised Greeks, Armenians, Moslems and Jews, and that the girls were intensely interested, and other mistresses borrowed the volume. A study of books issued by the S.C.M. would probably be fruitful, and produce books suitable for Mr. J. H. Phillips' Upper Fifth Form boys—books by Dr. T. R. Glover and other capable writers, who know how to get the human interest, *e.g.* out of St. Paul's letters as well as his travels, and to show above all the Jesus of the Synoptics and of St. John, and the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Yours very truly,

Marley, Southbourne-on-Sea. R. M. EMERY.

SIR,

If Mr. Phillips' dilemma is genuine he would seem to be unduly pessimistic. If he has a choice of subject, why not begin with the Synoptic Gospels? Surely he must know something about them himself? After that he might go on with a course on the Social Teaching of the Prophets; there is an excellent pamphlet on the subject by the Bishop of Woolwich, published by the Industrial Christian Fellowship for 1*d*. He might continue with a study of the *Gospel of St. John* and some of St. Paul's Epistles taken in conjunction with the *Acts*. This might perhaps occupy a year or two.

F. E. A. SHEPHERD.

Selly Oak, Birmingham.
May 25th, 1932.

SIR,

Was it chance or a fine sense of irony that led you to publish the two articles from two schoolmasters in your May number? In his article on Professor Hatch Kennett, the Headmaster of Alleyns School speaks of crowded lecture rooms, and of the privilege and rare experience of attending the Regius Professor's Old Testament classes. In the other article Mr. J. H. Phillips, on the staff at ———, speaks of masters compelled to resort to the expedient of filling inkpots, or studying Town Planning, rather than face the enquiries of the class sceptic, who, in his case, seems to have concentrated upon what he aptly describes as the sordid details of eastern matrimonial affairs. Was it chance that led you, sir, to recommend the Modern Churchmen's Conference at Bristol to the Parochial Clergy, especially the younger clergy, and to those engaged in educational work? Your readers will look for a further article from Mr. Phillips, perhaps after he has attended a Modern Churchmen's Conference, and met congenial friends, who will assure him that a knowledge of Hebrew is not necessary, neither of archaeology or of comparative theology, to make the Old Testament live again. It would be a remarkable triumph and well worth giving up part of the summer holidays to secure, if he could succeed in interesting his fellow teachers. And to those boys—after all, the Upper Fifth is not far removed from the undergraduate stage—what might it not mean if a teacher with Mr. Phillips' imagination and gift of expression could make the dry bones live, and reveal the soul reaching out to God. The Psalms are very human documents, and to-day in the present world-crises many are feeling how frail and powerless human nature is; the Bible studied as literature will not help us; as a revelation of God's purpose and will, it can supply our need. The spiritual plane is above the intellectual plane, and many are realising this, young people especially. Probably there are several in Mr. Phillips' form. A Sixth Form lad remarked a short time ago to the writer of this letter: 'Six months ago anyone who spoke of religion would have been laughed at, now we are all asking about it.' If your son ask bread, will you give him a stone?

W. H. B. YERBURGH.

Bredon Rectory, Worcestershire.
May 22nd, 1932.

CORRIGENDUM.

We regret that the letter of Mr. Ernest S. Thomas in our May issue, p. 111, was published uncorrected.—ED., *M.C.*